DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 755 EA 006 442

TITLE	Effectiveness, Efficiency and Equal Opportunity in the Public Schools of Massachusetts. Summary Report and Recommendations of the Governor's Commission on School District Organization and Collaboration.
INSTITUTION	Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, Boston.
SPONS AGENCY	Massachusetts State Board of Education, Boston.
PUB DATE	Oct 74
NOTE	59p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Centralization; Citizen Participation; *Comprehensive Districts; Consolidated Schools; Decentralization; Educational Change; Educational Finance; Finance Reform; Intermediate Administrative Units; Minority Groups; Regional Cooperation; *School Districts; *School Organization; *School Redistricting; *State Departments of Education; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

This report deals with school district collaboration and organization that can take place now and which could influence in a positive and constructive way school district change in Massachusetts. The Governor's Commission established associations with selected study sites across the State in 1973-74, and these study sites assisted them in developing final recommendations on the basis of actual experience with school districts and citizens. Major recommendations of the Commission include decentralization of school control in Boston, the establishment of collaboratives and cooperatives between smaller cities and their surrounding communities, and the restructuring of the Department of Education to be more visibly concerned with minority problems and citizen participation. Other topics considered include a collaborative approach to vocational education and finance reform and equality of educational opportunity. (Author/DN)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION AND COLLABORATION

MEMBERS

H. Felix de C. Pereira, Chairman — Past member of Advisory Council on Education, Financial Consultant, Dedham
Walter N. Borg — Past member of State Board of Education, South Egremont
Rose Claffey — Executive Secretary and Treasurer of Massachusetts Federation of Teachers, Salem
John E. Deady — Superintendent of Schools, Springfield
William P. Densmore — Member of State Board of Education, Worcester
Ronald J. Fitzgerald — Director of Research for Advisory Council on Education, Amherst
Benjamin D. Fleet — Member of Advisory Council on Education, President of Fleet Tire, Inc., East Sandwich
Charles Grigsby — Member of State Board of Education, Boston
Henry L. Hall, Jr. — Attorney with Ropes & Gray, Belmont
James J. Hammond — President of Fitchburg State College, Fitchburg
Connie Kaufman — Senior Researcher, Committee on Education, General Court, Boston
Elaine Kistiakowsky — Member of Advisory Council on Education, League of Women Voters of Massachusetts, Cambridge
Jerome R. Landry — Deputy Executive Secretary of Massachusetts Teachers Association, Natick
Richard J. Lavin — Executive Director of Merrimac Educational Center in Chelmsford, Leominster
Rhody McCoy — School of Education at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Frank P. McInerney — Head of Department of Athletics, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, South Hadley
Robert L.H. Miller — Associate Professor at Tufts University, Medford
Mary E. Warner — Chairman of Advisory Council on Education, Sunderland
Theodore S. Wilkins — National Shawmut Bank of Boston, Natick
Donald J. Zabriskie — High School Principal and member of the Legislative Committee of the Massachusetts Secondary School Principals Association, Newburyport

ADVISORS

William Black, Associate Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Education
Marcia Marker Feld, Executive Director, Metropolitan Planning Project in Newton
John E. Kearney, Director of Regional Education Centers, Massachusetts Department of Education
Peter J. Murphy, Director of Bureau of School District Reorganization and Collaboration, Massachusetts Department of Education

STUDY AGENTS AND STUDY SITE DIRECTORS

Robert H. Schaffer & Associates of Stamford, Connecticut — General Study Agents
Julie Donnelly — Project Assistant
Jewel Bell and Hubie Jones — Minority Group Concerns
Richard Boardman — Central Massachusetts Citizens Involved in Education, developing a citizen resource center
Ray Budde — Review of evidence and field surveys
Peter Demers — Springfield Regional Education Center, the role of regional centers in promoting collaboratives
John Evans and Paul Ross — The Institute for Educational Services, developing an educational bank
Raymond C. Parrott and Barbara Berns — Massachusetts Advisory Council on Vocational-Technical Education
Walter Patterson — The Education Cooperative in Natick, development of a collaboration model for transportation of students with special needs
Mary Ellen Smith — City-Wide Educational Coalition, citizen involvement in urban education
Edward F. Wilcox — Guidelines and models for district organization

The Commission is also indebted to the many members of the Department of Education, especially Commissioner Gregory Anrig and the coordinators of regional education centers; to the Merrimac Education Center; to William Dwyer and Paul Sullivan of the Massachusetts Association of Vocational Administrators; to Secretary of Educational Affairs, Joseph Cronin, and his representative, Ralph Atkinson; to Representative Nicholas Buglione, Attorney Thomas Wojtkowski of the House and Means Committee staff, Dr. John Warren of the Office of the Senate President; to William Wright of the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents and Alton Cavicchi of the Massachusetts Association of School Committees; and to the hundreds of public officials, students and other citizens across the Commonwealth who made suggestions and took the time to offer reactions to developing recommendations. Collectively these citizens constituted our most important study site.

MASSACHUSETTS ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Council:
Mary E. Warner, Chairman
Morton R. Godine, Vice Chairman
Philip C. Beals (past member)
Benjamin D. Fleet
Oliver W. Kerr
Elaine Kistiakowsky
Shirley R. Lewis (past member)
Milton Parsner
H. Felix de C. Pereira (past member)
Walter J. Ryan
Nina E. Scarito
Verne W. Vance, Jr.
Gregory R. Anrig, ex officio
Patrick E. McCarthy, ex officio

Staff:
Ronald J. Fitzgerald, Director
Ronald B. Jackson, Associate Director
Allan S. Hartman, Associate Director
Joan Fitzgerald, Administrative Assistant
Mary S. Gammons, Office Staff
Janet F. Flemming, Office Staff

COVER ILLUSTRATION — U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 097755

EFFECTIVENESS

EFFICIENCY

and

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF MASSACHUSETTS

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EA 006 442

Summary Report and Recommendations of
THE GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION AND COLLABORATION
From a Study Sponsored by the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education
in Cooperation with the Massachusetts State Board of Education

MACE Report

October, 1974

The Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education is an independent state agency created by special legislation (General Laws, Chapter 15, Section 1H) for the purpose of recommending policies designed to improve the performance of all public education systems in the Commonwealth. As such the Advisory Council provides support for studies which will recommend policies promoting and facilitating the coordination, effectiveness, and efficiency of these educational systems.

It is the policy of the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education that its studies should be disseminated and utilized in a manner which will best serve the public interest. Accordingly, permission is granted to reproduce in whole or part the text of this report.

FOREWORD

Equality of opportunity for all students, excellence of service, and efficiency of service are three critical goals for the public schools of Massachusetts. Recommendations for reorganization of local and state educational structures or processes are meaningful to the extent that they have potential for contributing to the successful pursuit of these goals. Members of the Commission on School District Organization and Collaboration kept this fact in mind while developing their final report.

Information, suggestions, and reactions from hundreds of educators, students, parents, and other citizens have been used to define a set of recommendations whose implementation would have a broad and constructive impact on the availability, quality, and cost of educational service across the Commonwealth. The impact would not be limited to one phase of public school operations or to one category of students. This is critical because narrowed focus on specific needs and issues can all too easily divert attention from efforts directed to general improvement in educational service.

This report is the result of many long hours of study and debate for which I express the Council's deep appreciation to Commission members, study site agents, and other participants. For the sake of the goals whose realization it is designed to promote, we now commend the report to each and every citizen and leader in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The report will have value to the degree that each of us makes a commitment to arranging or encouraging positive actions on its recommendations. That commitment is worthy of our current and very serious attention.

Ronald J. Fitzgerald
Director of Research
for the
Massachusetts Advisory Council
on Education

INTRODUCTION

This is a time to look with humility at what our schools are doing and to ask ourselves whether it is good enough. There is reason to question the relevance of our educational system to the needs of many students. There is a need to respond to questions from citizens who are asking whether they are getting full value for the money that is being spent in our schools. Education is the largest business in the Commonwealth. Like other businesses it should be subjected to frank evaluation and should be required to strive constantly for improvement in availability, effectiveness, and efficiency of its service. The Commission report is designed to promote this improvement.

The Commission has not tried to prescribe an exact format for improvements in educational service or even to make a comprehensive forecast of the direction these improvements will take. Rather it has tried to design structures that can be adapted to many situations by combining flexibility with the inherent strength that comes with broad participation in decision making. Its recommendations are relatively easy to execute and politically feasible. All of them are steps which can lead to further development. They do not involve substantial costs to the taxpayer. Indeed, if all of the recommendations are accepted, the financial efficiency of our statewide educational network will be greatly improved. Many economies can result from well planned collaboration efforts. However, the Commission has rejected the temptation to reach for the ultimate in efficiency that extreme centralization of power and organization appears to offer. The Commission recognizes that extreme centralization would inhibit creativity in the development of improved educational service and that there is no popular support for such an approach.

The Commission has not proposed specific changes in the method of financing our schools. To do so would have duplicated the work of several other groups who are preparing finance reform proposals. Rather, we have emphasized two points. First, that the present system of financing is unfair in terms of distribution of costs and equality of educational opportunity. Second, that attempts to remedy this unfairness should be made as part of a comprehensive approach to governmental financing and taxation reform. Piecemeal attempts to improve financing of education without relating it to the fairness of the general tax structure run the risk of appearing self-serving and insensitive to the broader problem. Equality of opportunity supported by a tax structure that is seen to be unfair rests on very shaky ground.

The Commission is not satisfied with its treatment of the urban education problem and the status of minority students. Substantial inequities and difficulties exist, and the way they have hitherto been approached or avoided has made their correction even more elusive. There is deep disillusionment in some cities about public schools. As a result of this disillusionment the Commission has encountered a lack of agreement within the urban population, doubts about the racial imbalance law, a perceptible trend among some minority citizens toward the "separate but equal" concept and a natural reluctance to participate in "another study that will get us nowhere." Clearly expenditure of money alone does not produce better education, better schools or better understanding. When students, parents and teachers feel good about their schools, good things happen. This feeling does not occur when the people consider themselves powerless to influence what happens in their schools.

It is the Commission's hope that its recommendations for the decentralization of control in Boston, for the establishment of collaboratives and cooperatives between our smaller cities and their surrounding communities, and for the restructuring of the Department of Education to be more visibly concerned with minority problems and citizen participation will help to create a climate in which more progress can take place. The Commission does not

believe that a detailed theoretical study of the governance and organization of our urban school systems is of practical value until such a climate exists.

In summary, this report does not offer a tidy plan, a table of organization or a map. It offers no easy and final solutions to any problems. It does, however, deal with school district collaboration and organization that can take place *now* — practically, politically and financially — and can influence in a positive and constructive way the changes that must take place.

H. Felix de C. Pereira
Chairman
The Governor's Commission on
School District Organization and
Collaboration

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I THE COMMISSION AND ITS PERSPECTIVES 7

II EQUAL ACCESS TO EXCELLENT SERVICE 10

A list of basic educational services 10
Recommendation #1, a service evaluation assistance system 12

III CONSOLIDATION OR REGIONALIZATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS 15

Recommendation #2, incentives for regionalization 17
Recommendation #3, guidelines for approving new school districts 18
Recommendation #4, abolishing superintendency unions 19

IV REGIONAL EDUCATION CENTERS AND REGIONAL COLLABORATIVES 20

Recommendation #5, educational service units 22
Recommendation #6, legislation on educational service units 24
Recommendation #7, an educational bank 24
Recommendation #8, a Commonwealth school and college center 25
Recommendation #9, coordination of regional approaches 26

V VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH 27

Recommendation #10, legislation for alternative systems of occupational education 29
Recommendation #11, use of state and federal funds for alternative systems of occupational education 30
Recommendation #12, an occupational education task force in each regional education center 30
Recommendation #13, action by the Division of Occupational Education 31

VI CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT INCLUDING MINORITY AND URBAN CONCERNS 33

Recommendation #14, location of state and regional education centers 34
Recommendation #15, planning an information management system 34
Recommendation #16, a deputy level administrator for minority concerns 35
Recommendation #17, an expanded assistance program for school committee members 35
Recommendation #18, citizen resource centers 36
Recommendation #19, arranging analysis of decentralization plans for Boston 36
Recommendation #20, implementation of recommendations from the Metropolitan Planning Project 37

VII FINANCE REFORM AND EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY 38

Recommendation #21, relating finance reform and equality of opportunity 38
Recommendation #22, relating finance reform to total municipal-state financing 38

VIII SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND COST ESTIMATES 41

APPENDIX A, Sample List of Potential K-12 Regional School Districts Based upon Approaching a Minimum of 3500 Students 46

APPENDIX B, Sample List of Potential K-12 Regional School Districts Based upon Expansion of All Existing Non-vocational Regional School Districts 52

I. THE COMMISSION AND ITS PERSPECTIVES

"I shall take an interest in . . . a system of general instruction which shall reach every description of our citizens from the richest to the poorest . . . our descendants will be as wise as we are, and will know how to amend, and amend it until it shall suit their circumstances . . ."

—Thomas Jefferson

Since 1966, the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education has sponsored numerous studies concerned with the quality and management processes of the public schools of the Commonwealth. Several of these studies have documented the need for major attention to school district organization and collaboration as a precursor to improved service to students. For example, one study group with representatives from commerce, industry, business, and the professions concluded that:

"Without increased cooperation between school districts, Commonwealth taxpayers must be resigned to continued duplication of costs, competition for tax dollars and personnel, as well as an unbalanced educational system frequently favoring the better financed communities." [1]

On the basis of an initial study of the complex question of school district organization by researchers at Boston College and at the request of the Advisory Council on Education, the Governor appointed a study commission to work from June of 1972 to June of 1974. This summary booklet highlights the recommendations defined by this Commission on School District Organization and Collaboration.

The Commission has concerned itself with the need to determine HOW MASSACHUSETTS COULD PROVIDE MORE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT EDUCATIONAL SERVICE AND MORE EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES THROUGH BOTH COLLABORATION AND IMPROVED ORGANIZATION. In short, the goal of Commission recommendations is to promote excellence, equality of access, and cost efficiency in educational service in the Commonwealth. The Commission recommends new structures only to the extent that members believe that such structures will contribute to realization of this goal of excellence with equal access and efficiency.

During 1972-73, Commission study agents, Robert H. Schaffer & Associates:

A. Reviewed data from the Boston College study, from other studies funded by the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, and from studies completed in other states, and

B. Met with a sampling of educators, government officials, and "grass roots" representatives to seek and assess reactions to possibilities for improvement in public education.

On the basis of the Schaffer analyses, Commission members concluded that improvement and equalization of educational opportunity in Massachusetts can be accomplished through action in six areas:

A. BUILDING GREATER SKILL AND CAPACITY TO MANAGE IMPROVEMENT IN EDUCATION.

B. ACCELERATING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE REGIONAL SERVICE CENTERS DEVELOPED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

C. ORGANIZING A STATEWIDE PROGRAM FOR IMPROVEMENT IN URBAN SCHOOLS.

D. ESTABLISHING A VARIETY OF POSSIBILITIES FOR BROADENING THE RANGE OF SERVICES AVAILABLE IN SMALLER DISTRICTS, POSSIBILITIES THAT INCLUDE COOPERATIVE EFFORTS AMONG DISTRICTS AND NOT SIMPLY CONSOLIDATION INTO LARGER DISTRICTS.

[1] *Report of the Massachusetts Business Task Force for School Management*. (Boston, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, 1970), p. 4.

E. PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO LAY CITIZENS INTERESTED IN PARTICIPATING IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES OF EDUCATION.

F. PROMOTING COLLABORATION ON THE DELIVERY OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICE AMONG MANY ORGANIZATIONS AND AGENCIES, NOT JUST AMONG SMALLER SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

To avoid the dangers of building a theoretical set of recommendations in each action area, the Commission established associations with selected study sites across the state during 1973-74. These study sites assisted the Commission in developing final recommendations on the basis of actual experience with school districts and citizens. While the recommendations are arranged under different headings than the areas listed above, we believe that they address each of the six areas in which action is needed.

Before proceeding through a brief review of the final recommendations, the following list of perspectives is presented as the framework for the Commission's decision-making process:

A. EDUCATIONAL GOALS FOR MASSACHUSETTS —

In 1971, the State Board of Education published a list of ten common goals or results for students to be pursued by public schools in the Commonwealth. These goals were defined through a process of participation by a large number of citizens and educators. They represent the first step in a total plan for a results approach to education, a plan that includes management and assessment goals and pathways intended to promote realization of achievement by students. Because the goals and management plan stress service to students and give direction to that service, they represent one of the most important and practical actions ever taken by the State Board of Education. The Commission therefore accepts these goals and plans as a basis for defining excellence of service in the public schools of Massachusetts.

B. STRUCTURING FOR IMPROVEMENT —

It has already been stated that the Commission recommends changes in the structure of educational organization only where such changes seem likely to stimulate or assist the pursuit of excellence, equal access and efficiency. This is the reason that we make fewer structural recommendations than some persons might expect. It is also the basis for our first recommendation calling for the establishment of an evaluation process, a process that can help local districts and state leaders design future changes in organizational structures and relationships on the basis of direct evidence of need.

C. ASSIGNING RESPONSIBILITY —

The Commission recognizes that goals are much more apt to be accomplished when specific human beings are assigned the responsibility for accomplishment. Therefore, perhaps more than is common in most studies, the recommendations from this study are labeled as applying to specific individuals and groups.

D. LOCAL SCHOOLS AS THE FOCUS FOR OPERATION —

Ultimately the quality of service to students is determined in local schools and programs. State actions can be justified only to the extent that they are designed and evaluated to affect the quality of local service programs.

E. INVOLVEMENT GENERATING COMMITMENT —

There is a clear message in research on organizational change. It is ". . . that people will more readily accept innovations that they can understand and perceive as relevant, and secondly that they have had a hand in planning."[2] Recommendations of the Commission are designed to encourage constructive involvement of citizens in educational decision-making.

[2] Art Gallaher, Jr., "Directed Change in Formal Organizations: The School System," *Change Processes in the Public Schools* (Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1965), pp. 41-42.

F. MONEY AND BETTER MANAGEMENT —
The massive infusion of more money would, by itself, offer no guarantee of progress in better fulfillment of human needs through current school organizations. As David Linowes states, ". . . money alone . . . cannot convert mismanagement to good management unless the system is reformed to include the proven basis of effective management."[3]

Keeping the above points in mind, let us consider some basic recommendations.

[3] David F. Linowes, *Strategies for Survival* (New York, New York: AMACOM, a division of the American Management Association, Inc., 1973), p. 4.

II. EQUAL ACCESS TO EXCELLENT SERVICE

"Knowing what we are trying to do is the first step in knowing when we have done it!"

If our focus is excellence of service to all citizens, the state should act to ensure that no matter where a citizen resides he or she will be provided with convenient access to basic educational services. While any list of such basic services should be constantly evolving, Commission analysis of the goals and "pathways" published by the State Board of Education and of suggestions from many citizens has led to the definition of the following list as an appropriate starting point. Each public school district should organize its resources and collaborative activities to provide its constituents with:

A. A results-oriented school management program characterized by needs assessment, goal definition, careful consideration and selection of action or program alternatives (so-called program budgeting), long-range planning, meaningful opportunities for informed involvement of students and other citizens in decision-making, and systematic use of evaluation techniques.

B. A level of economy in school operations that is explained annually for the past fiscal year through a published and widely distributed report on cost comparisons with other districts of similar size and organization categories utilized in reports of the Massachusetts Teachers Association. Such an annual report should include at least the following:
   1. Ratio of full-time certified staff members or staff member equivalents (including aides in differentiated staffing programs where the number of certified teachers has been reduced) to full time students (two half-day students counting as one full-time student, etc.).
   2. Total expenditure per full-time student in:
      a. 1000 accounts (central administration)
      b. 2000 accounts (instruction)
         (1) salaries supporting instruction
         (2) all other instructional expenses
      c. 3000 accounts (non-instructional service)
      d. 4000 accounts (operation and maintenance)
      e. 5000 accounts (fixed charges)
      f. 9000 accounts (cooperative programs)
   3. Staffing and expenditure comparisons among schools in the district in terms of disclosing local equalization and specialization of resources.

   Also, it could include such additional explanatory remarks as seem appropriate to the school committee with jurisdiction.

C. Early childhood educational services including at least pre-kindergarten screening for children with special needs and parent training programs.

D. Basic adult education services including at least those needed for a high school equivalency certificate.

E. A complete spectrum of service for students with special learning problems and disabilities as provided in statutes and Board of Education regulations.

F. Program coordination on a K-12 basis designed to eliminate gaps and unnecessary repetitions in learning experiences. For example, secondary school educators cannot assume that students have a background in terminology of modern mathematics unless programs in feeder elementary schools are designed to provide that background; even then mechanisms must be developed to assist students who are new residents of a region. Regional secondary districts can assume important leadership in ensuring coordination where a K-12 district does not exist.

G. Individualized instructional programs that allow students to work on their own readiness levels and to satisfy the need to succeed. (Refer to "Pathways" published by the State Board of Education.)

H. Instructional programs that use the physical and personnel resources of the surrounding geographical area and eliminate or reduce time and place restrictions which inhibit student progress. (Refer to "Pathways.")

I. Programs that promote the emotional and physical well-being of students, including a broad spectrum of pupil personnel services. (Refer to "Pathways" and state goal #1.)

J. Instructional programs that place a primary focus on providing students with basic and advanced communication and computation skills. (Refer to state goal #2.)

K. Programs in social studies, science, and humanities that increase a student's knowledge of cultural heritage, provide the student with discovery experiences, and promote the development of critical thinking skills. (Refer to state goal #3.)

L. School programs and activities designed to develop a capacity and a desire for life-long learning in each student. (Refer to state goal #4.)

M. A school environment and programs that give students a thorough understanding of the functioning of our society and government, meaningful experiences in democratic and consumer processes, and encouragement of commitment to exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship and to protect the rights of others. (Refer to state goal #5.)

N. A school environment and programs that promote understanding and positive interaction among persons of different race, religion, sex, ethnic group, and socio-economic group. (Refer to state goal #6.)

O. School programs that provide a broad range of opportunities for career exploration, vocational guidance, and both vocational and avocational training prior to high school graduation. (Refer to state goal #7.)

P. Programs that promote student awareness of personal, corporate, and political actions as they affect natural resources and environmental balances. (Refer to state goal #8.)

Q. A school environment and programs that help students to identify and clarify personal values and attitudes. (Refer to state goal #9.)

R. Significant opportunity for individual exploration and expression of talents and feelings in music, writing, electronic communication, art, drama, and movement. (Refer to state goal #10.)

S. A school reporting system that defines individual student progress on a continuum both against stated learning objectives and, in the case of basic skills, against nationally standardized norms.

At this point in time, students in the public schools of Massachusetts do NOT have equal access to this range of educational services. The degree of service available is strongly related to such factors as:

A. School district size — As earlier Council studies have documented, children growing up in one of Massachusetts' smaller districts ordinarily experience a narrower range of services and learning opportunities than children growing up in larger districts. This is not simply a direct matter of population size. Recent research[1] has shown that larger districts often exhibit the following advantages:

1. Availability of more specialists who propose new solutions and innovations.
2. Forced evolution of "mechanisms for overcoming conflict" among the many specialists, mechanisms that then promote cooperation among staff members in general.
3. "Heterogeneity in enrollment that produces unique problems and "new clients who make special demands" in the larger districts. While citizens in our major urban centers might be discouraged by the problems they are forced to face, deep analyses can reveal an equally serious problem in some of our smallest districts — the problem of not being forced to face serious problems that exist for a few students because those students do not represent a group large enough to demand attention.

[1] J. Victor Baldridge and Robert Burnham, *The Adoption of Innovations: The Effect of Organization Size, Differentiation, and Environment.* (Stanford, California: School of Education, Stanford University, 1974.)

B. Local financing abilities and values — At best, our current state aid program in education is simply ". . . a moderate source of property tax relief for local communities . . ."[5] The program offers no strong incentives for the general equalization of educational opportunity. Thus, the quality of local school programs is greatly influenced by both the availability of local resources and the value decisions implemented by the local decision-making processes.

C. The quality of school management processes — Sensitive, strong, and stable management is needed to pursue a results-oriented service program for students. That management is not consistently available in school districts across Massachusetts because:

1. There are tremendous variations in sensitivity and readiness to handle such issues as racism, sex discrimination, needs of non-English speaking students, and citizen involvement.

2. State agencies have been properly concentrating on defining expectations (mandated services, new laws and regulations, etc.) Now, THE TIME HAS COME FOR CONCENTRATING ON GIVING HELP TO LOCAL DISTRICTS. This help can reduce the variation in sensitivity and problem-solving ability on critical issues.

3. In the presence of a proliferation of directions (collective bargaining, state goals, laws and regulations on special education and discrimination, etc.) school committee and administrative positions located between the state and local citizens have often become the locus for a concentration of conflict and frustration. The turnover rates for school committee members has risen so that ". . . the typical superintendent works for a committee most of whose members did not appoint him."[6] This, in turn, has led to an increase in superintendent-committee conflicts that often have diverted human energy from important management tasks.

4. The proliferation of directions and lack of assistance have made the tasks of union superintendents virtually unmanageable. Superintendents serving three or more town districts in a union have been serving as executive officers and/or major participants in 130 to 180 night meetings per year; expending the bulk of their professional talent and energy in preparing for, going to, and as one such superintendent put it, "recovering from" night meetings. THE SUPERINTENDENCY UNION IS AN OBSOLETE MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION IN MASSACHUSETTS.

The most immediate message we offer to citizens with children in the public schools of Massachusetts is that they accept the reality that the quality of learning opportunities offered to their children now depends partially upon the location of their residence! To change this so that moving from one municipality to another in Massachusetts will not be a game of educational roulette will require an outstanding effort of cooperation among legislative, executive, educational, municipal, and citizen leaders. This brings us to our first major recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION #1. THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND ITS COMMISSIONER SHOULD TAKE STEPS IN 1974 TO DEVELOP A STATEWIDE SERVICE EVALUATION-AND-ASSISTANCE SYSTEM THROUGH REGIONAL EDUCATION CENTERS, A SYSTEM DESIGNED TO MEASURE AND PROMOTE AVAILABILITY OF THE NINETEEN CATEGORIES OF SERVICE LISTED IN THIS REPORT IN EACH PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT IN THE COMMONWEALTH.

We further recommend that this system exist with the following contexts and characteristics:

A. The system shoud be considered a necessary complement to and not in any way a replacement for beginning attempts to develop a statewide system for assessing results of

[5] Paul W. Cook, Jr., *Modernizing School Governance for Educational Equality and Diversity* (Boston, Massachusetts, Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, 1972), p. 18.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

instruction. We strongly endorse the building of a statewide program for assessing results, especially to the degree that such a program helps local districts and schools to build their own evaluation capabilities. However, measuring results is an incomplete practice unless one also measures:

1. Whether or not an organization is really trying (has programs) to pursue these results, and
2. Whether or not the appropriate programs are really readily accessible to all students.

Without these latter measurements, informed decisions cannot be made about what actions might best be taken to achieve better results.

B. The system should be used to encourage a process of continuous improvement in availability of educational service, not a focus on absolute standards.

C. The system should result in preparation of an evaluation and suggestion report for each school district or school district group (two or more districts under one superintendent) once every three years. Each district should be required to review its report within 90 days at a public school committee meeting and then to make it readily available to media representatives who request an opportunity to read the report.

D. While the system could be used by the regional centers and the State Board to identify occasions for rewarding or even chastising school districts, its major purpose should be to provide assistance in the statewide pursuit of equalization of educational opportunity for students. Information concerning "success" in one or more districts can be exchanged through the regional centers and offered as a resource to other districts.

We believe that there are alternatives for creating and operating such an evaluation assistance system without creating excessive time demands on regional center personnel. The components of such alternatives could be:

A. Advance preparation of lists of sample performance indicators under each of the nineteen service categories defined herein. The Advisory Council on Education office will continue to serve as a clearinghouse and source of assistance for pursuit of the Commission recommendations. Therefore, Council staff members stand ready to assist in preparing lists of sample performance indicators if the Board of Education implements the recommended evaluation assistance system.

B. Preparation and submission of a self-evaluation report by each local district or district group in a way somewhat similar to earlier action on a goals report requested by the Board of Education. This self-analysis could then be followed by either

1. An observation verification visit by a staff member of a regional education center who would then prepare a report listing his or her judgments on:
   a. Availability of service
   b. Suggestions for ways in which improvements might be pursued by visiting and observing other districts, using Department services, exploring establishment of a collaborative with other districts or a college, etc.

OR

2. A one or two day observation verification visit by a board of visitors briefed and later de-briefed by a staff member of a regional education center. Volunteers for such boards of visitors could be drawn from the ranks of the citizen and student advisory boards and the educational organizations already affiliated with each regional center. If volunteers were required to visit districts other than their own, information exchange among school districts would be facilitated. Eventually, volunteers might even be exchanged across regional boundaries to extend this process of information exchange. After de-briefing of a board of visitors, the supervising staff member from the regional office and or an appointed or elected chairman from the board could prepare the appropriate report.

While some readers might question the local readiness for this type of evaluation process, persons who responded to a questionnaire distributed by the Commission and all regional education centers provide the possibility of a different perspective. To the statement that THE REGIONAL CENTER SHOULD HAVE PEOPLE WHO CAN ASSIST IN EVALUATING PROGRAMS AND SPECIAL PROJECTS, the responses on eventual development of this assistance from the regional centers of the Department of Education were:

RESPONDENT GROUP	NUMBER	*THIS PRACTICE WOULD BE:* DESIRABLE or HIGHLY DESIRABLE	UNDESIRABLE or HIGHLY UNDESIRABLE
Central office Administrators	119	96	10
Other professional staff members	147	119	10
Students	47	39	1
Parents	18	12	2
School committee members	16	11	2
Elected officials	4	4	0
Others	36	29	2
TOTALS	387*	310*	27*

*NOTE: 41 of the respondents felt that the practice would be both desirable and undesirable. 9 had no opinion; some did not comment on this item.

Responses to our questionnaire might have been less positive if we had asked whether or not such evaluation assistance should be mandated on a statewide basis. However, if the creation and operation of this system is pursued as a helping exercise, we believe that it will be supported by the majority of educators and other citizens. We also believe that it can become a truly effective force for the promotion of equal educational opportunity for students.

In closing this section, we would like to emphasize the difference between the state requiring that certain services be provided and the state specifying exactly how those services must be provided. The Commission believes that, with few exceptions, the pathways to service should be a matter of local and regional discretion. For example, while consolidation of small school districts is one way to build part of the capability for providing citizens with a complete range of educational service, it is not the only alternative available to small districts. The remainder of this report is dedicated to ways in which the state can and should assist local and regional educational communities in defining and pursuing viable alternative routes to excellence, equality and efficiency in educational service.

III. CONSOLIDATION OR REGIONALIZATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS

"The thing most needed in the United States is united notions."
—M. Dale Baughman

Let us begin with a look at some recent statistics that place school districting in Massachusetts in focus:

A. There are approximately 392 operating school districts in the state.

B. Districts coinciding with individual town and city boundaries are the predominate type of school governance unit with 184 towns and cities serving 1,011,679 students, approximately 87% of the students of the Commonwealth.

C. Only 7.5% of the students are in schools operated by regional districts.

D. Nearly 87% of the public school students in the state are now receiving their education in complete, whole K-12, 13, 14 school districts. These 180 whole (one school committee and one superintendent) school districts serve 1,012,128 students.

E. Approximately 13% of the students in the state, 154,678 students in 187 school districts, are in non-K-12 districts. Not all of these 187 school districts have the same structure; some actually approach the K-12 concept in operation. Some are coterminous unions and regions under the responsibility of a single superintendent and two school committees from grades K-12.

F. Approximately 5.8% of the public school students in Massachusetts reside in towns which are members of school unions (one superintendent serving several school committees).

Most of the towns in school unions are relatively small. Each town in a union has its own school committee. Different towns in a union of elementary districts sometimes send their older students to different regional secondary schools. For many years, there has been strong controversy over the question of consolidating these and other small districts into larger districts, each with one school committee and one superintendent covering a K-12 spectrum of grades.

While analyzing this controversy over consolidation or, as it is called in Massachusetts, regionalization; the Commission has reviewed previous state and national studies. We have listened with great care to comments made by literally hundreds of citizens from different walks of life. Finally, we have analyzed data from a sampling of school districts in Massachusetts. This sample was tightly controlled with regard to two variables: size and the amount of equalized valuation per school-attending child. Twenty-four of the school districts chosen had assessed valuations per school attending child of at least $10,000 below the state average; eighteen of the districts had assessed valuations per school-attending child of at least $10,000 above the state average. In each of these groups, there were sets of districts grouped by size.

The evidence from our interviews and sampling, in Massachusetts supports conclusions similar to those reported in previous studies. These conclusions are summarized as follows:

A. In terms of having a base for broad curriculum offerings within an isolated school using traditional classroom organization, most elementary school authorities prefer to have at least one class per grade level. Most secondary school authorities prefer to have at least 500 students (the latter ensuring a graduating class of about 100 students). Assuming a class size of 28, there are 37 school districts in Massachusetts with elementary operations that do not meet the preferred size standard. There are 28 districts with enrollments too small to produce a high school graduating class of 100. Curriculum realities become most visible in the high schools, where smaller schools simply do not offer the number and variety of courses offered in larger schools. While quantity does not guarantee quality, availability of curriculum experiences is one of the main factors influencing equality of opportunity for students.

B. With one exception, the number of courses available to students in the richer districts of our sample exceeded the number of course offerings available in the districts with a lower assessed valuation per school-attending child.

C. The amount and quality of "articulation of curriculum" which actually takes place depends upon the strength of the superintendent and number and attitude of the school committees involved. Where there are more than two school committees involved, the superintendent can become so weighed down with meetings and "regular school committee business" that articulation becomes a low priority on his or her list of tasks to be accomplished.

D. There are gross inequalities in expenditure supporting instruction among school districts in Massachusetts. With few exceptions, richer districts provided significantly more dollars for non-personnel support of instruction than did poorer districts in 1971-72. For example, depending upon where a student lived in 1971-72, he could have received either $11.16 in support of textbooks and library-audio-visual material or $53.28!

E. Without exception and in every size category in our sample, a higher percentage of graduates in richer districts entered a four-year college than did graduates from poorer districts. From a size viewpoint, the smallest districts in both richer and poorer categories had smaller percentages of graduates entering four-year colleges.

F. Smaller districts usually find it much more difficult to support adequate staff training and renewal programs (courses, conferences, workshops, sabbatical leaves, etc.).

G. Smaller districts usually find it difficult to achieve operating economies in purchasing, transportation, central administration, and other support services.

H. While current research on pupil achievement and class size does not document the probability of significant benefits from doing so, some smaller districts support unusually small class sizes or low pupil-teacher ratios as part of the price for remaining independent.

The above general conclusions are explained in greater detail in our study site reports and technical documents. They are not presented as a case for consolidation of small school districts. Rather, they are presented as problems which should be addressed in one of several ways. First, let us consider consolidation.

One cannot offer a simple number solution for consolidation because research studies show that the number of pupils needed for effectiveness and/or economy varies with the program or service being considered. Here is a sample list of the range of research study results:

PROGRAM OR SERVICE	PUPIL BASE RECOMMEND
General Quality	1500 minimum (Conant, 1969) 25,000 (Comm. for Economic Development, 1960) 50,000 (Benson, 1965)
Quality with Economy	5,000 minimum (Fitzwater, 1958) 20,000 (Faber, 1966)
Community Control	7000 to 8000 (Havighurst, 1968)
Administrative Decentralization or Administrative District	10,000-12,000 (AASA, 1959) 20,000-50,000 (IAR, Columbia U., 1961) 12,000-40,000 (Bundy, 1967)
Special Education	20,000 (Great Plains School District Organization Project, 1968)
Business Administration	35,000-50,000 " "
Electronic Data Processing	100,00 " "
Adult Education	20,000 minimum " "

Currently available data seem to indicate:

A. Administrative districts should contain at least 5000 and not over 50,000 students whenever this can be conveniently arranged. Considering geography and population density, a minimum nearer 3500 is a more workable figure for our state.

B. Administrative districts should, wherever possible, be supervised by one superintendent working for one K-12 school committee.

C. When administrative districts do not coincide with optimum sizes for such functions as special education, business administration (purchasing being an example) or sophisticated data processing, other options should be explored such as:

1. Service from a regional education center (called intermediate districts in many states) or
2. Regional cooperatives and collaboratives among public-private school units and other agencies or
3. Purchasing of services from a centralized public or private agency.

D. Size and collaboration do not guarantee quality. They can be used to make quality more possible and more economical. The rest is up to strong and sensitive management procedures that utilize clear goals and objectives, frank evaluation of results from program activities, and meaningful communication with the clients being served.

To apply these general conclusions to school districts in Massachusetts, we offer the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATION #2: LEGISLATIVE LEADERS AND THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD JOIN IN REVIEWING AND, AS NECESSARY, AGAIN AMENDING SECTION 16D OF CHAPTER 71 OF THE GENERAL LAWS TO ENSURE THAT INCENTIVES FOR REGIONALIZATION APPLY TO ALL REGIONAL DISTRICTS IN MASSACHUSETTS. THIS SECTION OF THE GENERAL LAWS SHOULD BE REVIEWED ALONG WITH ANY FUTURE PROPOSALS FOR MAJOR FISCAL REFORM IN MASSACHUSETTS.

Prior to the enactment of Chapter 492 of the Acts of 1974, statutes on regionalization stipulated that:

A. 15% of Chapter 70 school aid is added to the aid given each municipality for even partial membership in a regional district.

B. There is no minimum or maximum limit on grades included in a region.

C. Total state aid for construction has a maximum limit of 65%.

In the 1974 session of the General Court, the State Board of Education introduced legislation to:

A. "Grandfather" or continue the 15% additional aid or incentive for districts now receiving same.

B. Give 2% per grade for regionalization composed of 8 or more grades. The maximum possible would be 26% for complete K-12 regionalization.

C. Require all regions formed in the future to include four or more grades.

D. Clearly define that school construction is NOT necessary for formation of a regional district.

E. Prohibit regional aid exceeding the regional operating assessment to any one town, a situation that does occur under the current statute.

F. Raise state aid for construction to 75% in all K-12 regional districts.

This proposed legislation had several advantages. It would:

A. Create a new incentive for K-12 regionalization, providing more citizens with the advantages of K-12 articulation and administrative economies.

B. Allow pursuit of the articulation and economic benefits without requiring construction, a step toward desirable flexibility in state policy.

C. Leave the final choice to local citizens, avoiding the inflexibility of mandating.

D. Leave the State Board of Education with the right to approve or disapprove formation of a region, a way to guarantee state protection of citizen interests beyond limited town boundaries.

E. Eliminate the profit-making now associated with membership in some regional vocational schools. Certainly no one ever intended that a town should receive more in state aid for membership in a region than it costs the town to participate in the region!

F. Continue to honor the Commonwealth's commitment to providing at least some financial incentive to cities and towns that regionalized their school systems with an understanding of that commitment.

The General Court incorporated the concept of encouraging K-12 regionalization in passage of Chapter 492 of the Acts of 1974. However, certain important intentions of the original State Board of Education proposal will not be realized in all regional districts unless additional amendments to Section 16D of Chapter 71 are passed in 1975 or thereafter. For example, additional amendments are necessary to ensure that (1) regional school districts containing cities are covered by the intentions of Chapter 492 of the Acts of 1974 and (2) all regional districts including those with a regional valuation percentage in excess of 153.8% will receive at least some incentive payment.

The cost projections for complete implementation of the State Board of Education incentive proposals are quite reasonable. The cost in 1973-74 terms, if the 42 partial regions and 30 small communities all united in K-12 districts (an unlikely possibility), would be an increase of approximately $6,000,000 in annual Chapter 70 aid. Construction aid of 75% for K-12 regions could, at most, cost approximately $920,000 per year for the next 20 years (again, in 1973-74 terms). However, the prohibition on profit-making would save approximately $10,000,000 annually. Thus passage and implementation of all State Board recommendations could save the State approximately $3,000,000 per year while encouraging the formation of school districts capable of greater efficiency and economy. The Commission endorses movement in this direction as an example of fine leadership and cooperation on the part of the State Board of Education, its Commissioner, and elected officials.

RECOMMENDATION #3: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD FOLLOW THREE BASIC DIRECTIONS IN APPROVING PROPOSALS FOR FORMATION OF NEW OR EXPANSION OF EXISTING SCHOOL DISTRICTS:

A. DEVELOP K-12 SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT:

1. ADEQUATELY MEET THE NEEDS OF ALL TOWNS IN A PARTICULAR AREA, EXCLUDING NO COMMUNITY THAT NEEDS MEMBERSHIP TO SERVE ITS STUDENTS PROPERLY.
2. ENCOMPASS AN ADEQUATE PUPIL BASE. REFER TO APPENDIX A FOR GUIDANCE ON THIS CRITERION.
3. EXPAND PARTIAL REGIONAL DISTRICTS TO INCLUDE ALL GRADES IN THEIR MEMBER TOWNS. REFER TO APPENDIX B FOR GUIDANCE ON THIS CRITERION.

B. DEVELOP K-12 SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT POSSESS THE CAPABILITY OF PROVIDING A HIGH QUALITY OF SERVICE IN EACH OF THE NINETEEN CATEGORIES LISTED ON PAGES 10-11 OF THIS REPORT.

C. DEVELOP AN ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM IN WHICH A SUPERINTENDENT IS RESPONSIBLE TO ONLY ONE SCHOOL COMMITTEE NO MATTER HOW MANY COMMUNITIES ARE SERVED.

Under this recommendation, it is our hope that the State Board of Education will establish a strong public information program in every region under the direction of the Bureau of School District Organization and Collaboration. Printed materials, mass media presentations, and local conferences should be utilized to call certain current and potential facts to the attention of all citizens. MOST VOTERS NEED MUCH MORE INFORMATION TO MAKE THEM ADEQUATELY AWARE OF:

A. THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF REGIONALIZATION for students, teachers and taxpayers alike.

B. The indirect but real manner in which unnecessarily high costs associated with extremely small districts affect the pocketbooks of all citizens including those living in very large school districts. For example, if staffing costs are very high in a small district because of sparse population, taxpayers of larger districts share in this expense through their contribution to the state aid program.

C. The error of viewing regionalization as a process that requires school construction or elimination of separate town elementary schools.

State educational officers should take the initiative in fulfilling this information need.

RECOMMENDATION #4: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD DEFINE AND PROPOSE AND THE GENERAL COURT AND THE GOVERNOR SHOULD APPROVE LEGISLATION ABOLISHING SUPERINTENDENCY UNIONS BY JULY OF 1978.

Multiple school committees over one school administration are an anachronism. They promote management by crisis rather than management by objective. We suggest that this legislation have the following characteristics:

A. Require that each current superintendency union have its member towns merge with other districts to form K-12 units OR AT LOCAL DISCRETION that the entire union be converted to a partial regional school district including all of the current member towns or with such exceptions as the State Board might approve; all by July 1st of 1977 and in accordance with planning procedures and guidelines promulgated by the State Board.

B. Allow inclusion of a section in new regional agreements specifying the continuation of one or more existing town elementary schools if:

1. All member towns agree to the financial arrangements and other details of said section, and
2. The region is approved by local voters for implementation on or before July 1st of 1977.

C. Provide that, in the event that one or more towns in a current union fails to meet the July of 1977 deadline, the State Board may design and direct the July of 1978 implementation of a consolidation or regionalization plan designed by the State Board.

While these recommendations on consolidation do not mandate the disbanding of districts that may be too small to provide a broad range of adequate service at reasonable cost, the Commission believes that there are at least two alternatives that the state can promote for remedying this situation — service from regional education centers and collaboration among school districts and colleges. The next section of this report deals with these possibilities.

IV. REGIONAL EDUCATION CENTERS AND REGIONAL COLLABORATIVES

Through the work of one of its study sites, the Commission has surveyed regional arrangements for the delivery of educational service across the entire nation. It is apparent that these arrangements have been developing in response to the same problem addressed by consolidation. Repeated in words from a report of the National Educational Finance Project,[7] this problem is that:

> At least 80% of the 18,000 school districts in various states do not have sufficient enrollments to provide even minimally adequate programs and services without excessive costs.

While the number of school districts in the nation has been reduced since 1971, the problem still exists.

We repeat this quotation because it offers strong insight into the fallacy of assuming that equal levels of expenditure per school district can result in equal opportunity for students. Even in the presence of attempts to create districts of equal enrollment size through consolidation, cost differentials related to population density and other socio-economic factors cannot be avoided.

In any event, there is a basic difference between consolidation (called regionalization in Massachusetts) and regionalism as exemplified in regional education centers. Nyquist describes this difference as follows:

> . . . in consolidation the separate school jurisdictions lose their identity as they are merged into a single governing structure, (whereas) in regionalism the local districts retain their identity and local boards of education give up only limited responsibility and authority to the intermediate or regional districts.[8]

The difference is attractive. It provides a legitimate alternative to mandating a size range for school districts and, more important, a powerful tool for equalizing the availability of educational service to students.

There are two basic approaches to educational regionalism being implemented across the United States. First, there is the creation of so-called intermediate service agencies by the state; in effect a middle echelon in a three-echelon educational structure consisting of local districts, intermediate districts or centers, and the state department of education.[9] Second, there is the growth of voluntary educational collaboration in no way mandated by legislation or regulation. Each approach has advantages and disadvantages.

Regional or intermediate service agencies created and regulated by the state can have much greater influence in equalizing educational opportunities among local districts. They also have a higher potential for utilizing state resources to increase communication among school districts and other agencies. On the opposite side of the coin, such agencies are more apt to be hampered and slowed by statewide regulations.

Voluntary educational collaboratives are usually free from jurisdictional regulations such as those that might prevent local districts in different regions from collaborating through a highly structured state system of separate regional centers. As a matter of survival, they are apt to be more sensitive to rapid changes in the needs of participating districts. They do not focus on state-wide needs for equalization although they can certainly promote equalization of opportunity for students in their participating districts. Finally, they often do not have the power and means to facilitate information exchange with non-participating districts and agencies.

The Commission believes that Massachusetts should not lock itself into one of the two

[7] National Education Finance Project, "Future Directions for School Financing," (Gainesville, Florida, 1971), ERIC ED 059 526.
[8] E. Nyquist, "How BOCES Serves Metropolitan Systems Concept in New York State," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 55, No. 1 (1973).
[9] While our superintendency unions can be considered a minor form of regionalism, the union structure is ineffective because it does not encourage sharing of authority or activities beyond the hiring of joint employees.

approaches to regionalism. Rather, our state should pursue the benefits of both approaches. Our recommendations are designed accordingly.

While the Commission strongly endorses the present efforts of the Department of Education toward decentralization into regional centers, we must point out that certain characteristics common to successful centers in other states are lacking in Massachusetts. We do not believe that regional centers in our state can realize their full potential for services to local districts until:

A. Local districts are granted a formal role in the governance of certain regional operations. As the state makes expectations clear to local districts, THOSE WITH THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR PURSUING STATE EXPECTATIONS SHOULD BE GIVEN A MAJOR ROLE IN DEFINING THE ASSISTANCE THEY NEED FROM REGIONAL CENTERS. State officials should avoid the error of unilaterally deciding upon services to be offered or of having some groups other than those responsible for results be the decision makers. If the latter practice were initiated, it could all too easily stimulate a rejection of responsibility as school managers came to realize that they were being asked to achieve results but were not being given the authority to manage the resources needed for such achievement.

B. Local districts are contributing to the cost of operating regional centers — This is a way to promote the understanding that a center belongs to the region as well as to the state. Also, if regional centers are really going to increase service to local districts substantially, they are going to need local as well as state dollars.

C. The state provides funds beyond federal dollars to help initiate collaboratives — The practice of reimbursing some expenses of successful collaboratives after they are operating is useful but not equalizing. Richer districts tend to be rewarded for their ability to plan and start collaboratives, and nothing is done to help poorer districts where the most help is needed. Advance funding for well-planned and obviously needed collaboratives could correct this situation, especially if a state unit existed to help districts with initial planning.

D. Regional centers are granted the right to receive and disburse funds as fiscal agents for local districts, not just as fiscal agents for the State Board of Education. The present practice of one school district having to assume the role of fiscal agent for other districts in a collaborative is a factor that discourages formation of collaboratives, especially among smaller districts with limited or no business staffs.

Again, our recommendations are designed to give attention to these matters.

Let us inject a note of caution here. This report is not designed to comment on all aspects of the operation of regional education centers. The Commission has worked with regional centers to solicit suggestions from educators, legislators, students, and parents on their hopes for the development of regional services. The suggestions from 425 respondents have been tabulated by the Division of Research and Statistics of the Department and have been made available to the Commissioner of Education. We believe that the State Board of Education and the Commissioner are reviewing these suggestions, and are proceeding on decentralization of Department services in a thorough and logical manner. This report is intended to add some suggestions to this planning process, not to substitute for it.

Also, this is a point where we wish to reemphasize the word EQUALIZATION. Voluntary collaboratives are very attractive in terms of the home rule interests that most of us value. We hope that most regional collaboratives will be voluntary. However, a purely voluntary approach is inadequate for ensuring that all children have relatively equal educational opportunities. Since such equalization is our major interest and is the ultimate justification for collaboratives, we have carefully moved one step beyond the purely voluntary approach. While avoiding any suggestion that the state or regional center employees be able to mandate the existence of regional collaboratives, we believe that a strong majority of districts in a region should be able to mandate such collaboratives. To this degree, we place the interest of equalization for children ahead of pure voluntarism.

RECOMMENDATION #5: THE BOARD OF EDUCATION SUPPORTED BY THE GENERAL COURT AND THE GOVERNOR SHOULD TAKE IMMEDIATE ACTION TO INCLUDE AN EDUCATIONAL SERVICE UNIT (ESU) IN EACH REGIONAL CENTER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. EACH OF THESE UNITS SHOULD HAVE TWO BASIC TASKS: FIRST, SUPPORTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF VOLUNTARY COLLABORATIVES BOTH IN THE REGION AND ACROSS REGIONAL LINES AND, SECOND, ESTABLISHING SUCH MANDATORY REGIONAL SERVICE AS MIGHT BE APPROVED BY A REGIONAL ESU COUNCIL AND THE COMMISSIONER.

To the extent possible, this should be accomplished with current personnel and funds. Whatever additional funds are needed should be provided in future budgets for the department to support the following at each regional center:

A. Hiring of a service unit director at an adequate annual salary, a minimum of $25,000. (Total cost = 6 centers x $25,000 = $150,000).

B. Assignment of one full-time secretary to work for the unit director. (Total cost = 6 centers x $10,000 = $60,000).

C. Meeting and consultant expenses for the operation of the unit under a governing board. (Total cost = 6 centers x $8,000 = $48,000).

We offer the recommendations for these expenditures with no reservation whatsoever. An administrator with skills equal to those of the many superintendents in a region could easily promote the establishment of collaboratives that would save the state more money than the total cost of an ESU. The state now pays too much Chapter 70 school aid that preserves and rewards inefficient practices in isolated school districts. We also recognize that realistic salaries for ESU directors should be accompanied by equally realistic salaries for the regional center coordinators under whom ESUs and many other decentralized department activities would be operated. We strongly recommend that salaries of regional education center coordinators be raised above the $25,000 level in recognition of the great increase in importance of regional centers.

Each ESU should be charged with the following tasks:

A. Review service needs in school districts in the region and each of its sub-regions, giving special attention to needs implied by the evaluation-and-assistance system described in Section II of this report.

B. Pursue fulfillment of those needs by:

1. Arranging to provide service directly to ALL school districts in the region whenever such action is approved by a 2/3 vote of membership on the ESU governing board *and* is approved by at least 3/4 of the concerned school committees with the understanding that operation of the service will be funded by future assessments against all school districts in the region except as cases are covered by grants from the state or other sources.

   NOTE: An example here might be the establishment of a data processing and computer center with its own administration and assessment program (not administered by the ESU director). A majority of the 387 respondents to our regional survey expressed the belief that this type of service should be operated on a regional basis. Given a time period for adjustment, even those school districts already leasing data processing and computer equipment could benefit from replacement of such by a regional collaborative.

2. Assisting the establishment of voluntary collaboratives among interested districts and other agencies when such collaboratives are not approved by a 2/3 vote but can be funded with monies from interested districts or any other sources other than an assessment against non-participating districts.

C. Promote attention to the potential for multiple service by collaboratives. While a collaborative might be initially designed to fulfill one service need, administrative efficiency can

be pursued by planning the potential for expansion of other services through the same collaborative. This will help to prevent unnecessary proliferation of administrative units.

D. Give primary and immediate attention to the possibility of promoting:
   1. Regional occupational programs as described in the next section of this report.
   2. Staff development programs similar in concept to the program now sponsored jointly by the Merrimack Education Center, Fitchburg State College and Northern Essex Community College.

      NOTE: A detailed description of the Merrimack program has been filed with the Commissioner of Education. We recommend that the Department of Education place copies of this description in the library of each regional education center.

   3. Cooperative programs for the transportation and/or instruction of children with special education needs.

      NOTE: A detailed description of a well researched model for cooperative transportation has been filed with the Commissioner. We recommend distribution to the library of each regional center and to each requesting school district. Also, the Advisory Council on Education will supply a major handbook on building collaboratives for special education service upon completion of a study now underway.

E. Give consideration to the possibility of establishing media service centers, information systems, and other regional programs thoroughly coordinated with statewide planning whenever so requested by the State Board of Education or whenever reports of the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Vocational-Technical Education, the Secretary of Educational Affairs, or a special legislative commission so recommend.

We recommend that an ESU governing board be established in each region in a manner to be defined by the State Board of Education in consultation with the Massachusetts Association of School Committees. The following is just one example of a process for establishing a nineteen-member board in a region:

A. Each region could be divided into three sub-regions by the Board of Education, each sub-region including a minimum of eight and a maximum of twenty-six school districts depending on the regional center involved.

B. Each school committee could elect one representative to a sub-region board for a three-year term. That representative could be a member of the school committee or its superintendent or any other district citizen at the discretion of the school committee. The school committee could elect a replacement to fill the unexpired term of its representative, if he or she had to leave office during said term.

C. Each sub-region board could meet, organize through election of officers, and then elect five members to the governing board of the Educational Service Unit, this organization and election to take place in September of each year.

D. The Commissioner of Education could appoint four additional members to each ESU governing board, perhaps selecting his appointees from the Regional Advisory Councils that already exist in each regional education center.

E. Each sub-region board could meet a maximum of once bi-monthly beginning in September of each year to advise its representatives on the ESU governing board and to discuss other topics of mutual concern.

F. Each ESU governing board could meet, organize through election of officers, and begin supervising operations of the ESU through the ESU director in October of each year and bi-monthly thereafter.

NOTE: We further recommend that, after the first three years of operation, employment of any ESU director be subject to joint approval of subsequent three year contracts by the ESU governing board and the State Board of Education.

After a regular schedule for the meetings of the ESU governing board is announced, school committees with representatives on that board could be obligated to avoid scheduling their school committee meetings on the same dates.

RECOMMENDATION #6: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD DEFINE AND PROPOSE AND THE GENERAL COURT AND THE GOVERNOR SHOULD APPROVE ANY LEGISLATION NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT THE OPERATION OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICE UNITS.

Such legislation should, if at all possible, be passed early in the 1975 session of the General Court and should define the following:

A. Creation of educational units as described under recommendation #5 but with such modifications as are necessary to remain compatible with other decentralization activities of the Department of Education.

B. The authority for each ESU to receive and disburse funds beyond those authorized by state appropriation.

C. The authority of each ESU and such collaboratives as it might mandate to assess all of the districts in its region for any mandated services beginning in fiscal year 1976 or fiscal year 1977 (depending on the date of legislative enactment) and to establish a revolving account for such salaries and operations as are not covered by state appropriation.

   NOTE: This authority should obligate school districts to include funds in the appropriated budgets under the cooperative programs (9000) category when assessments are mandated. It might, at the discretion of the State Board include an initial nominal assessment to all districts, for general support of the ESU, perhaps fifty cents per pupil.

D. Authority of voluntary collaboratives to receive and disburse funds and to assess costs to participating districts.

E. Authority of each ESU and voluntary collaboratives to hire personnel, to incur capital costs, and to enter into contracts with other public and non-public agencies in and outside defined state regions. Collaboratives should be open to private schools, colleges, and non-school agencies.

RECOMMENDATION #7: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION IN CONSULTATION WITH:

A. THE LEADERSHIP OF THE GENERAL COURT,

B. THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS,

C. THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION,

D. THE MASSACHUSETTS ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION, AND

E. THE INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

SHOULD DEFINE AND PROPOSE AND THE GENERAL COURT AND GOVERNOR SHOULD APPROVE LEGISLATION CREATING AN EDUCATIONAL BANK FOR PROMOTION OF COLLABORATIVES.

After an initial State appropriation, this bank would operate by loaning start-up funds to proposed collaboratives and by using a portion of the fees charged for loans to expand a reserve of funds for future financing of worthy collaboratives.

Past experience with formation of collaboratives and with implementing new special education services has demonstrated the importance of advance funding. Too many opportunities for collaboration are neglected, especially in less wealthy districts, because funds are not available for initial planning and implementation. The spirit of cooperation and initial enthusiasm needed often pass as districts wait for budget funds not available at the time that an idea or opportunity arises. Relatively small amounts of advance funding could solve this problem in public education just as the availability of development loans solves similar problems in the realm of private business. The amounts of loans could be held to a low

enough level (perhaps not over a half of one percent of the total calculated by adding together the annual budgets of each district participating in a collaborative proposal with each district being required to repay its share of the loan and fees from its next budget) so that taxpayers would not be committed to large future expenditures. Yet the taxpayers would be gaining an opportunity to support well defined collaboratives.

This loan approach would be unique in the nation, a chance for a state to be paid back for helping to promote efficiency rather than to be just giving grants or "gifts" to local school districts. Participation of higher education representatives is critical to planning a bank since the existence of truly effective school-college collaboratives is not at all consistent across our state. A well-planned bank could help to remedy this problem and to set the stage for additional school-college planning essential to facing the enrollment and training problems of the future.

The Commission has already had an initial draft of legislation prepared on this topic. However, it will need major revision on the basis of actions taken on previous recommendations. The decision-making process on loans must be harmonized with whatever processes and boards are created for regional decision-making. The initial draft of legislation will be made available to interested parties through the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education.

RECOMMENDATION #8: THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION, THE BOARD OF STATE COLLEGES AND THE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD JOIN IN ESTABLISHING A COMMONWEALTH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE CENTER AS PART OF OR LINKED TO AN EXISTING MASSACHUSETTS STATE COLLEGE.

The Massachusetts State College System's study entitled "Agenda for Renewal" and this Commission's report converge in defining the need for better mobilization and utilization of resources in Massachusetts. Joint efforts at the state college and community school levels could build important bridges between the institutional resources of higher education and the public at large.

By establishing a school-college center in at least one state college (perhaps more later, depending on results), the Commonwealth could focus productive attention on the following tasks:

A. Statewide assessment of community and college needs and resources and identification of where the two sets of needs and resources can be coordinated to provide improved service to the public.
B. Statewide coordination of college resources to support regional education centers and voluntary collaboratives in education.
C. Exchange of information on learning and collaborative alternatives being tried across the Commonwealth.
D. Definition and promotion of pilot programs for school-college collaboration, especially collaboration directed at solving urban problems.

The latter task is especially important in the face of the fact that "No one group is taking a primary leadership stance at this time to establish an overall urban policy, although there is general acceptance of the need and an expressed willingness to cooperate by most groups."[10] This statement is as true in the education policy area in Massachusetts as it is in the general policy area of the nation. A planning center instituted for schools and colleges could become an important resource and model for addressing urban problems. Therefore, like most of our recommendations, it could be a cost-saving investment on a long-term basis.

The Commission recommends that the professional staff for the school-college center consist initially of a director, an assistant, two research associates, and possibly two or more interns involved in advanced graduate study. Funds for staffing and operating costs in the initial three years should be sought from federal and/or private foundation grants. Finally, during the initial three years an evaluation should be conducted to determine the value and feasibility of eventual funding by the Commonwealth.

[10]Center for Responsive Technology, "Special Report: Urban Affairs," New Ways, Summer (Charles F. Kettering Foundation, 1974).

RECOMMENDATION #9: THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS, THE CHANCELLOR OF HIGHER EDUCATION, AND THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION SHOULD GIVE STRONG ATTENTION TO ENSURING THAT CERTAIN ACTIONS OF LEADERSHIP AND COORDINATION CONTINUE TO BE ADDRESSED AS REGIONAL APPROACHES ARE PURSUED.

These actions include at least the following:

A. Gaining continued support from legislative leaders, executive offices, citizen groups, municipal leaders, educational associations, and state boards for establishing regionalism as a high priority deserving non-partisan support.

B. Asking superintendents, school committees, principals, teachers and other educational groups to restructure their regional groups around regional education centers and educational development units for maximum efficiency and communication potential.

C. Convincing state and, if necessary, federal officials that regional boundaries should NOT be rigid lines across which collaboratives do not occur. Just as numbers for consolidation vary with function, collaborative boundaries must vary for different purposes and in the presence of different resources. Educational leaders must insist that other departments of state and national government recognize this reality even as attempts are made to cooperate with the planning of interdepartmental regions.

D. Clarifying role and authority relationships in regional educational centers and educational development units. There have been problems with Department central office and regional center relationships in the past. The combination of decentralization and the introduction of regional governance could increase these problems unless the matter is addressed very carefully and very thoroughly.

E. Building strong communication systems among regional centers, ESU's, and voluntary collaboratives. Information on success and common problems must be shared, and talent must be exchanged among regions if collaboratives are to realize their full potential.

F. Building a strong staff training program, one that emphasizes management processes and principles, within a new organizational framework.

G. Building a reward or motivations system for both individuals and agencies. Much more attention needs to be given to rewarding outstanding performance if individuals and organizations are to be properly motivated toward establishing useful collaboratives. In this regard, the Commission strongly endorses the desirability of adequate funding of the legislation on collaboration enacted in 1974. This legislation would allow the Department of Education to award grants to approved collaboratives, up to $10,000 per member district. Expending $300,000 to $500,000 in annual grants to cost-saving collaboratives could be a very effective approach to stimulating interest in regional cooperation. Combined with the proposed loan program, it would create a very favorable climate for the growth of valuable teamwork among school districts, colleges, and other agencies in Massachusetts.

V. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH

Vocational education is at once a field in which Massachusetts is experiencing the best of educational accomplishments and the greatest of problems. On the positive side of the ledger, the Board of Education and Commissioner have acted to raise career exploration and training to a high priority in the Commonwealth. Innovative projects like PROJECT CAREER (development of a data bank of occupation-focused learning objectives and related instructional data) and special products like the handbook on COLLABORATIVE PROGRAMS FOR OCCUPATIONAL COMPETENCE compiled by Occupational Task Force #2, provide our school districts with important resources. Citizens in many communities have supported the creation and operation of excellent regional vocational schools.

There are serious realities on the problem side of the ledger, however. These include the facts that:

A. Regional vocational schools served only 13,526 students or 9.7% of the approximately 240,000 grade 9-12 students enrolled in occupational education programs in 1973-74. Even after county schools and trade schools are added to the vocational school total, we find that the overwhelming majority of students interested in occupational training are serviced by city and town school districts without special vocational facilities beyond those installed for business and computer training programs.

B. While some students who are not enrolled in vocational schools have access to special part-time programs in occupational training, there is at least one group of students with very limited access to occupational training. This group consists of those students enrolled in districts with a student population below 10,000 and without membership in a regional vocational school. Many authorities agree that a minimum of 600 vocational students in grades eleven and twelve is necessary in order to operate an adequate traditional program. Assuming one out of three high school students in occupational programs in a thirteen-grade district, this translates to the need for a total district enrollment of 10,000. There are 106 districts whose students face this problem of enrollment that appears too low to provide an adequate base for extensive opportunities in occupational classes.

C. Traditions, actual recruitment and admission procedures, programming, and location of schools have resulted in:

1. An inadequate level of career and occupational training service to the great mid-group of students who inhabit what is known as the "general curriculum" in non-vocational high schools, a group that constitutes 20% to 60% of a high school population.
2. In some cases, an apparently inadequate level of service to students with special education needs (a problem recently addressed by Board of Education regulations under the new special education law).
3. Three (or more) out of four students in regional vocational schools being boys.
4. A low level of enrollment of non-white minorities in regional vocational schools (approximately 2% in fourteen schools surveyed), a problem these schools cannot address effectively unless they are empowered to reach across current membership boundaries through collaboratives or other arrangements.

D. Construction costs for the alternative of building more regional vocational schools are rising rapidly.

E. Coordination and flexibility between academic feeder schools and regional vocational schools is frequently lacking. Many students are, in effect, forced to decide prior to ninth grade which environment they will enter — a vocational or academic high school; this may or may not be the right time for an individual student to make such a total decision.

In short, we can conclude that OUR STATE PROGRAMS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ARE ACHIEVING GOOD RESULTS BUT WITH TOO FEW STUDENTS AND AT A COST THAT IS PROBABLY TOO HIGH TO ALLOW ADEQUATE EXPANSION OF SERVICE THROUGH THE SINGLE ALTERNATIVE OF BUILDING MANY MORE REGIONAL VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS DEDICATED TO THE PRESENT GRADE 9-12 PATTERN.

There are several alternatives that deserve attention along with the possibility of constructing more regional vocational schools in Massachusetts. The Commission has forwarded details on alternatives reviewed in California, Michigan, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Massachusetts to the Commissioner of Education. We shall describe only two of these alternatives in this summary.

One of the alternatives which impressed the Commission was the model developed and tested at Blue Hills Regional Technical School under the leadership of Superintendent-Director William Dwyer. This model is based upon planning promoted by the Massachusetts Association of Vocational Administrators. It involves major expansion in the functions of a vocational school. Instead of just providing learning opportunities to its regularly enrolled students, the school becomes a regional resource. At Blue Hills, this has involved such added activities as:

A. Hiring staff members who teach occupational courses in non-vocational high schools of the region. In 1973-74, approximately 750 students were serviced by this program of extending vocational learning opportunities through non-vocational schools. As facilities and staff are expanded at Blue Hills, this off-campus service is scheduled to be extended to over 2,500 students.

B. Providing late afternoon shop and laboratory experiences at Blue Hills to secondary students from other schools. To date, space limitations have made it necessary to restrict this service to a total of 60 students with special education needs. The program is scheduled to expand to the level of servicing 200 students in future years.

C. Loaning both hardware and software to other schools in the region.

D. Providing workshops on career education for non-vocational teachers in other schools.

E. Providing career counseling services and a traveling careermobile for career orientation and awareness programs in elementary and secondary schools of the region.

F. Assisting other schools with curriculum development, budget planning, preparation of grant proposals, design of facilities and equipment, etc.

G. Offering continuing education opportunities to approximately 800 adults in the region.

Excellent publications are available from Blue Hills for those interested in profiting from this model. Some of the major benefits of this approach are:

A. Increased career exploration opportunities for students in non-vocational or non-comprehensive high schools and, to some degree, elementary schools.

B. Increased opportunities for college-bound students to elect a career development minor in their home high schools.

C. Increased involvement of non-vocational teachers in career development planning.

D. Higher or more cost-effective use of relatively expensive human and material resources.

Such benefits could flow from any vocational school to its surrounding schools. A large vocational school in a city can become a central resource for other city and suburban schools as well as a regional vocational school can become a resource for nearby communities.

A second alternative which impressed Commission members as one of several worth pursuing is the California Regional Occupational Program, a program that depends upon use of the community as a classroom. This is not a new idea. Various work-study and apprentice programs already operational in Massachusetts and elsewhere in the nation show success with this concept. However, use of the community is not really a major part of the Massachu-

setts delivery system for occupational education. In California, such use has been moved from the "nice idea" level to an approach which has become a vital and almost primary component of the occupational delivery system.

The Regional Occupational Programs (ROP's) received their impetus from state legislation. In general they operate on the basis of:

A. Students receiving their academic instruction in their home high schools, retaining their affiliation with these schools.

B. Approximately 90% of the occupational training taking place "on the job" in business and industry, the remaining taking place in leased or donated facilities under the direct control of the ROP staff.

C. Very low capital costs, a sample being $200,000 in the first six months of operation for the North Orange County ROP serving 2800 students.

D. Relatively low operating costs, a sample being $1.60 per student hour (including capital) in the first year of operation and now down to $1.25 per student hour in the North Orange County ROP.

More detailed information on the North Orange County ROP is available from the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education.

It is logical to assume that the ROP alternative will work best in urban and suburban areas with a relatively large employer base. With that caution, we are enthusiastic about the:

A. Flexibility

B. Low cost

C. Positive student attitudes observed

D. Improved communication with participating school districts

E. Good placement contacts.

Also, we recognize the need to face the problem of quality control of teaching in non-school settings, the need to negotiate proper relationships with labor unions, and business leaders, the need to consider transportation problems of students. For example, the North Orange County ROP relies on most students arranging their own transportation; this might deny opportunities to some students. In short, an ROP program is not a blissful panacea. Like most educational possibilities, it can be a useful alternative for certain localities and regions of the state.

On the basis of these observations we offer our recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION #10: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD DEFINE AND PROPOSE AND THE GENERAL COURT AND THE GOVERNOR SHOULD APPROVE ANY LEGISLATION NEEDED TO FACILITATE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ALTERNATIVE SYSTEMS FOR DELIVERY OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION SERVICES INCLUDING VARIATIONS OF BOTH THE BLUE HILLS MODEL FROM MASSACHUSETTS AND THE REGIONAL OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM MODEL FROM CALIFORNIA (ROP).

While our State's experience at Blue Hills provides the basis for duplication of that model, more study will be needed to use the California model. The Commission will make a copy of the appropriate California Legislation available to the Commissioner of Education. We suggest under this recommendation that special attention be given to ensuring that:

A. An ROP or any other unit operating as a voluntary collaborative has the right to assess costs directly to participating districts as opposed to having one participating district designed as fiscal agent as now provided in Section 4E of Chapter 40 of the General Laws.

B. Establishment of an ROP is subject to Department approval on the basis of an analytic process outlined in recommendation #12 below.

C. State regulations allow the use of non-school employees in ROP instruction programs supervised by certified educators.

D. An ROP or any other unit operating as a voluntary collaborative has the right to enter into contracts receiving or giving services to private and other public agencies and individuals.

NOTE: This is critical in terms of private sector cooperation needed for ROP operation and in terms of realizing the potential for cooperation with established vocational schools and community colleges.

E. No legal barriers or regulations exist to prevent an ROP from contracting students from one high school into a service that can be provided in another high school.

F. ROP's and their participating high schools are NOT required to but may provide transportation to students for travel to and from ROP learning activities.

NOTE: The path to success here might be careful location of ROP's in the first place followed by gradual introduction of transportation service.

RECOMMENDATION #11: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD CONTINUE TO USE STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDS AND NEGOTIATIONS WITH DISTRICTS REQUESTING THESE FUNDS TO PROMOTE EXPANSION OF ALTERNATIVE SYSTEMS FOR DELIVERY OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION IN MASSACHUSETTS.

As the Board directs over one million dollars per year into occupational program development, attention to model building can be emphasized. The ideal would be to have one major model of each type located in Western Massachusetts and another in Eastern Massachusetts for convenience of viewing by citizens and educators in each of these locations. Committed and aggressive leadership from the Division of Occupational Education could provide the alternatives with the visibility they deserve. The very act of establishing models could help to identify important elements to be addressed in legislation needed to move from the model stage to more extensive practice.

RECOMMENDATION #12: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION IN CONSULTATION WITH THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE BOARD OF REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD ACT AT ONCE TO ESTABLISH AN OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION TASK FORCE IN EACH REGIONAL EDUCATION CENTER. THE TASK FORCE IN EACH REGION SHOULD BE CHARGED WITH REPORTING ON THE AVAILABILITY OF OCCUPATIONAL SERVICE ACROSS THE REGION AND, WHERE APPROPRIATE, WITH DEFINING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCREASING THE LEVEL AND/OR THE EFFICIENCY OF THAT SERVICE.

The work of such a task force should be coordinated with the evaluation-and-assistance system described under recommendation #1. The work should begin on the foundation of information already available from the Division of Occupational Education but should be expanded to include information from student and citizen advisory councils and professional associations in the region. The Springfield Regional Education Center during its period of work with the Commission has provided a model for communication among these groups in addressing the topic of guidance services. At the very least, such a task force should include the coordinator of the regional center; a staff member of the Division of Occupational Education; representatives of the advisory councils, school committee and professional associations already working with the regional education center; directors of one or two regional vocational schools; business leaders and representatives of any community colleges in the area. The Commissioner and State Board could then work with other agencies to supply each task force with information from state and national sources and could act on all requests for approvals of proposals for new vocational schools, ROP's, etc., in light of analyses and recommendations from the regional task forces. This coordination process would give Department of Education representatives more information for participating in program review discussions at the higher education level. This latter point is critical because THERE SEEMS TO BE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR MUCH MORE COORDINATION BETWEEN REGIONAL VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES in avoiding role duplication and in exchanging resources.

RECOMMENDATION #13: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE COMMISSIONER SHOULD HAVE THE DIVISION OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION CONTINUE ENCOURAGING MIDDLE SCHOOLS AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS THRU THE 10TH LEVEL TO INITIATE OR EXPAND MORE EFFECTIVE CAREER EXPLORATION AND PRE-VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS. IN ADDITION, THE DIVISION SHOULD BE DIRECTED TO GIVE EQUAL PRIORITY TO WORKING WITH VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS TO DEVELOP A STATEWIDE PLAN FOR:

(1) EXPANDING THEIR CAPACITY TO SERVE STUDENTS ON LEVELS 11 AND 12 AND

(2) ESTABLISHING THEIR ROLE AS REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS FOR OCCUPATIONAL OR CAREER-ORIENTED PROGRAMS.

Secondary schools continue to need more state assistance in developing such programs as:

A. Community work experiences.

B. Use of community resource personnel.

C. School-industry personnel exchange programs.

D. Occupational survey and decision-making activities for students.

E. Simulated work experiences, especially in business management and office operations.

F. Student exchange between schools with different vocational or prevocational opportunities.

Movement of more Department personnel into regional offices places specialists closer to school districts and to business and industrial leaders interested in assisting school programs. Beginning with the 1974-75 school year, emphasis should be placed on developing the potential created by decentralization. The Business Management Task Force volunteers who have been working with the Bureau of School Business Management are already working with regional education centers, Department administrators, and educational organization leaders to support this endeavor.

A plan for expansion of vocational school service to students in levels 11 and 12 might involve state-assisted but voluntary reduction of service to students on lower levels as academic or comprehensive schools develop a greater capacity for vocational service although the Commission does not recommend an arbitrary and complete focus on any grade-level cut-off point. It might also involve greatly expanded admission and outreach programs for students not now served adequately by vocational schools. If institutions of higher education develop the needed out-reach and service area planning capacities recommended in the 1973 Advisory Council on Education report entitled STRENGTHENING THE ALTERNATIVE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION SYSTEM: CONTINUING AND PART-TIME STUDY IN MASSACHUSETTS, outreach programs for vocational schools could be coordinated with these post-secondary capacities to provide a long-term spectrum of educational opportunity and assistance to citizens not interested in college degree programs.

Finally, as shown with the Blue Hills model, programs of service to students not in vocational schools could be greatly improved if regional, county, and city vocational schools were structured to allow more use of the talents of their staff members in non-vocational school districts. For example, here is a section from the job description of an assistant to the superintendent of the Minuteman Regional Vocational Technical High School: (one of the assistant's tasks is) "supporting local school districts in the planning of cross-articulated curriculum programs." This is a direction that should be expanded and implemented in all vocational schools to extend their influence and support beyond their own walls. Under its state plan, the Department of Education has made federal funds available for this direction.

In making these recommendations, the Commission faces one major problem. The Department of Education in general and the Division of Occupational Education in particular do not have all of the resources needed to stimulate and adequately support the major actions necessary in individual communities and regions. IF EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IS GOING TO BECOME A REALITY IN THE AREA OF CAREER EXPLORATION AND OCCUPATIONAL COMPETENCE, CITIZEN, LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND EDUCATIONAL LEADERS MUST FOCUS THEIR EFFORTS AS THEY HAVE DONE SO ADMIRABLY IN THE AREA OF SPECIAL EDUCATION. Without such a focus, inequality of opportunity will remain a major characteristic of vocational education in Massachusetts. THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS CAN BE ESPECIALLY HELPFUL IN THIS REGARD. By acting as a primary advocate for the directions described in this report, the Secretary can help to gain needed resources and legislation for the Department. In doing this, the process of reorganization and regionalization can be advanced for one major and highly visible purpose — providing more effective and efficient educational service to all of the citizens of the Commonwealth.

VI. CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT INCLUDING MINORITY AND URBAN CONCERNS

We began this report with a recognition of the well documented fact that involvement generates commitment. Examples of an opposite reality are all too common in public education — citizens opposing educational programs based on plans formulated without their involvement. We can also view the phenomenon of specific citizen or citizen groups approaching educational leaders in a way that creates problems and generates defensiveness. Finally, we can perceive minority groups whose concerns and needs are not given adequate attention in the design and daily operation of educational programs. In terms of promoting the ability of our schools to serve all children adequately, it is necessary to have strong forces working to alleviate these problems.

We do not wish to pretend that any set of procedures will eliminate conflicts between groups who desire different services or priorities in our public schools. However, conflicts in ideas can be a stimulus to progress if mechanisms exist to promote decision-making based on sincere consideration of all points of view. As an adaptation of a recent report of the Governor's Commission on Citizen Participation, we list four practices useful in striving for constructive citizen-school interaction:

A. THE ROLES AND POWERS OF PARTICIPANTS IN DECISION-MAKING ARE CLEARLY DEFINED IN ADVANCE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS. Too few state agencies and school districts have roles adequately clarified before people focus on issues requiring major decisions. Then, when controversial issues do develop, conflict and confrontation become more common than participatory decision-making. Too many people begin to focus on "winning" rather than on participating in a process. This is true even on school committees where well intentioned but sometimes uninformed candidates are elected on the basis of running "against" rather than "participating in" current decision-making processes. There is real confusion between issues and decision-making processes. While the Massachusetts Association of School Committees offers some training on this topic to newly elected school committee members, there is little or no state encouragement offered to prospective participants. Strong state leadership is needed at both the school committee level and beyond to promote clarification of roles in educational decision-making.

B. ADEQUATE RESOURCES AND INFORMATION ARE MADE AVAILABLE TO PARTICIPANTS IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS. Local citizens and their school districts do not now have a convenient and rapid way of gaining information on educational research and current practice. While there are exceptions dependent upon periodic publications by the Department of Education and other agencies, many local and state groups spend their time gathering information already gathered by someone else. In terms of the cost of time of human beings, this is wasteful and discouraging. It reduces the effectiveness of decision-making processes. If one group is perceived by another as deliberately withholding information (a tactic alleged to have been used in conflicts on racial imbalance), suspicion and tension replace the potential for cooperation.

C. THE VIEWPOINTS OF ALL RELEVANT PARTICIPANTS ARE SOLICITED AND CONSIDERED IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS. Relevant participants are those who will be affected by a decision. For public schools, this certainly means that representatives of many minority groups not commonly elected to school committees should be consulted by those who are elected. This is a matter of ethical obligation which has been ignored in the past but which should not be ignored in the future. Hopefully our educational system has succeeded in helping to prepare a public to be intolerant of inattention to this obligation.

D SOMEONE ACTS AS A MODERATOR AND HARMONIZER TO PROMOTE A FOCUSED AND CONSTRUCTIVE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS. Moderators and harmonizers are in short supply when one considers the plethora of issues and committees generated in modern society. In the absence of the moderators and the presence of increasingly critical fiscal and social problems, school systems all too often are becoming battlegrounds between sides of various issues rather than places where people from all persuasions meet to act together for their children.

To promote more extensive implementation of constructive practices for citizen participation, the Commission offers the following recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION #14: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD ENSURE THAT THE BOSTON, WORCESTER, AND SPRINGFIELD REGIONAL EDUCATION CENTERS AND/OR ASSOCIATED CITIZEN RESOURCE CENTERS ARE READILY ACCESSIBLE TO URBAN RESIDENTS. THE BOARD SHOULD ALSO PROPOSE LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CREATE A STUDY COMMISSION TO DETERMINE THE VALUE AND FEASIBILITY OF RELOCATING CENTRAL OFFICES OF THE DEPARTMENT AND OTHER STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.

One of the first requirements for helping citizens to be more constructive and more successful in approaching school districts is for those doing the helping to be readily accessible to the citizens. Inner city residents who need help are not well served by regional offices or citizen resource centers located both outside the inner city and off mass transit lines. At the very least, the regional centers in the listed cities should be located on mass transit lines or should have satellite citizen resource centers (see recommendation #18) in locations that are convenient to inner city residents.

In relation to central offices of the Department, top Department leaders and non-decentralized services of the Department should be made much more accessible to school district representatives and citizens from the entire state. An education center near the junction of Interstate Routes 90 and 495 might increase accessibility. On a relatively long-range basis such a center could be planned to include:

A. Central computer facilities for a statewide educational information network.

B. Offices of all other state educational boards.

C. Conference or meeting facilities for educators, legislators, and citizen groups.

D. Rapid communication with legislative and executive offices in Boston.

E. Rental space for offices of statewide organizations closest to the Department in educational management (school committees, superintendents, parent-teacher organizations).

A study of this possibility should consider advantages, disadvantages, and cost effectiveness. We recommend a legislative study commission because conclusions should be reached primarily on the basis of convenience to the citizens' legislators who have been elected to represent and because members of the General Court should be involved in the development of any plan that might require dynamic political action in the future.

RECOMMENDATION #15: THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS SHOULD REQUEST STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION ON ALL LEVELS TO JOIN HIM NOW IN ESTABLISHING A PLANNING PROCESS AND SCHEDULE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A STATEWIDE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR EDUCATION. THE PLANNING SHOULD EMPHASIZE COORDINATED COLLECTION OF USEFUL INFORMATION AND MAKING THE INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO LEGISLATORS, MINORITY GROUPS, OTHER CITIZENS, AND LOCAL SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES RATHER THAN SIMPLY SERVING PLANNING NEEDS OF THE STATE BOARDS AND OFFICES.

Service of regional education centers to citizens and school-college collaboratives could be greatly strengthened by the development of such a coordinated information system. Taxpayers cannot afford the luxury of separate planning and development of such a system by

separate boards and offices followed by after-the-fact attention to possible savings and efficiencies that could be realized from cooperative planning and development.

RECOMMENDATION #16: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD PROPOSE AND THE GENERAL COURT AND THE GOVERNOR SHOULD APPROVE THE APPOINTMENT OF A DEPUTY LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR FOR MINORITY CONCERNS AND EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY.

At present, Department efforts to promote equal educational opportunity cannot address an adequate range of considerations on a consistent basis across all divisions of the Department. Resistance to Department efforts in promoting racial balance absorb a large amount of the time of both the Commissioner and personnel in the Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity. If all of the problems of unequal opportunity that could be identified through the statewide evaluation system proposed earlier and all of the legitimate concerns of minority citizens are going to be addressed properly, one administrator with inter-divisional authority must be responsible for devoting all of his or her time and energy to this area. This administrator should:

A. Be a member of a minority group.

B. Be assisted by a MINORITY CONCERNS TASK FORCE appointed by the Board of Education.

C. Be supported by the director and staff of the Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity.

D. Be charged with developing plans for expanding Department action in the areas of:

1. Assistance to citizens on questions of equal opportunity.
2. Providing public information on racial imbalance, particularly in relation to Boston and Springfield.
3. Review of all division programs for attention to minority and equalization concerns.
4. Evaluation of metropolitan planning projects.
5. Promoting legislation on equalization and minority concerns.
6. Encouraging appointment of minority representatives to special boards and committees.

All of this should be done in a coordinated manner to avoid the fragmentary impact of giving attention to equalization and minority concerns on a piecemeal basis, one project or statute at a time.

RECOMMENDATION #17: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND ITS COMMISSIONER SHOULD ACT IMMEDIATELY TO SUPPORT THE EFFORTS OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL COMMITTEES IN DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING A GREATLY EXPANDED ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEMBERS.

Such expansion should emphasize an increase in the content and regional availability of management information programs for both prospective and current school committee members and their superintendents. The information programs should remain under the control of School Committee Association leaders but should be supported by extensive efforts of the Department of Education, the Advisory Council on Education, the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents, and perhaps one or more institutions of higher education. Most important, the evaluation-and-assistance system described earlier in this report should be used to encourage maximum participation in the program by both school committee members and superintendents. Managing school programs to achieve more equalization of educational opportunity will require directors who have been given the assistance and information needed to pursue that purpose. Very few citizens are closer or more important to public schools than school committee members. They deserve more help than they are receiving right now from state sources.

RECOMMENDATION #18: THE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD SUPPORT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A CITIZEN RESOURCE CENTER IN ASSOCIATION WITH EACH REGIONAL EDUCATION CENTER.

The value of such centers, especially in urban locations, is demonstrated by the public information services being provided to Boston citizens by the City Wide Educational Coalition. This organization of citizens provides a focal point for questions and answers on area schools, a focal point responsive to citizens without limitations imposed by bureaucratic or political perspectives. Citizen control of such centers is important. Therefore regional education centers should serve as cooperating hosts but not controlling agencies for citizen resource centers. On the basis of experience with a model center operated in Worcester by the Central Massachusetts Citizens involved in Education, the Commission can offer detailed suggestions for the creation of additional citizen centers. In this summary report, we simply list the general suggestions that:

A. Citizen centers should be established at the rate of one per year beginning with urban locations.

B. The citizen centers should be operated by private, non profit organizations with an adjunct relationship to the Department of Education.

C. At least half of an annual budget of $15,000 to $20,000 per citizen center should come from private sources; the remainder should be contributed by the Department along with space, office furniture, and supportive services.

D. The personnel of one or more existing centers can be used as consultants for coordinating the development of a statewide network of citizen centers. Approximately $2,500 would be needed to support activities for creating one citizen center.

E. Regional education center personnel should be charged with assisting citizen center personnel in:

1. Gaining access to Department information.
2. Utilizing citizen participation material produced by the Department and the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education.
3. Building positive associations with professional organizations.
4. Developing training and seminar programs for citizens.
5. Exchanging information with other citizen resource centers.
6. Working closely with the regional education center advisory council.
7. Avoiding partisan roles that would disqualify a citizen center from receiving continued Department support.

Until citizen resource centers are established in each regional education center, regional center personnel should continue to utilize Department resources and Advisory Council publications to provide citizens with as much non-partisan assistance as can be arranged.

RECOMMENDATION #19: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD PROVIDE THE PUBLIC WITH A DETAILED ANALYSIS OF DECENTRALIZATION PLANS FOR THE BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN OCTOBER OF 1974. THIS ANALYSIS SHOULD BE BASED ON A COMPARISON WITH THE 1970 REPORT ENTITLED *ORGANIZING AN URBAN SCHOOL SYSTEM FOR DIVERSITY—A STUDY OF THE BOSTON SCHOOL DEPARTMENT*.

Research studies listed earlier in this report suggest 50,000 students as a maximum limit for school district size. This is a problem that should be addressed as directly as the problems of inadequate size in smaller districts. It is very doubtful that meaningful citizen participation can be arranged until and unless Boston's school governance units are brought closer to the citizens they serve. This could be accomplished in one of several ways: creation of neighborhood boards as implemented in Louisville, Kentucky; adoption of the alternative governance plan to be considered by Boston voters in the fall of 1974; or adoption of a new

plan not yet proposed. The Commission itself has not defined a specific governance proposal for Boston because it addressed statewide and not individual city issues. However, as a matter of statewide planning procedure, we believe that the citizens of Boston deserve the assistance of a careful analysis by authorities on educational governance before voting in November of 1974. Authors of the 1970 report listed above could provide the basis for this analysis at the request of the State Board of Education. Certainly the Department of Education should provide advice on reorganization to the largest as well as to the smallest school districts in the state. The Boston governance question provides the Department with an opportunity for expanding its capabilities in giving assistance to urban citizens.

RECOMMENDATION #20: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD PROVIDE A STAFF UNIT IN THE BOSTON REGIONAL EDUCATION CENTER TO PLAN, ENCOURAGE, AND ADMINISTRATE IMPLEMENTATION OF AT LEAST TWO MODEL RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING PROJECT—A PATHWAYS MODEL FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS AND A PAIRWAYS MODEL FOR ELEMENTARY STUDENTS. THE GENERAL COURT AND THE GOVERNOR SHOULD ACT TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF BOTH THE STAFF UNIT AND THE SUBSEQUENT IMPLEMENTATION OF MODELS.

The staff unit could be an early implementation of the Educational Service Unit (ESU) concept mentioned earlier, or it could be a temporary unit that would eventually be replaced by an ESU. In any event, its basic task would be to utilize the planning results from the Metropolitan Planning Project to promote collaboration among the districts and citizens in the metropolitan area.

It is not the purpose of this report to duplicate a detailed description of the recommendations from the Metropolitan Planning Project. Such descriptions are now available in the published reports of that project. Rather we summarize by stating that, in the Pathways model, secondary students from urban and suburban schools would meet together in carefully selected sites along a transportation path like the Green Line subway to share special learning and or bilingual experiences. In the Pairways model, two suburban elementary schools and one urban elementary school would join to form a "neighborhood" within which learning experiences would be shared. These models provide a possibility for expanding cooperation between urban and suburban citizens in a way that would enrich the lives of all participating students. Results in the Boston area could be shared through regional education centers, citizen resource centers, and eventually a statewide information management system to serve as a stimulus to similar developments elsewhere. It would be a tragedy and disservice to the citizens of Massachusetts if the potential defined by this project were ignored.

VII. FINANCE REFORM AND EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Concurrent with the work of the Commission on School District Organization and Collaboration, the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education has been sponsoring a review of the state program for financial aid to schools. Study director John E. Heffley has provided the Commission with an interim report on this review, a report based upon extensive study of national and state realities and initial questionnaire returns from 141 respondents (municipal officials, school superintendents, and members of the state legislature). This interim report reinforces our belief in two recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION #21: ALL FUTURE ATTEMPTS AT SCHOOL AID REFORM SHOULD BE PURSUED WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF ORGANIZATIONAL REFORM FOR EQUALIZATION OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY.

This is the framework pursued by all Commission recommendations. Equal expenditures will not buy equal opportunity in the face of local and regional cost differentials or for children with different combinations of needs. We need a stronger system of helping local districts to guarantee the availability of basic and special services to all citizens. In the absence of that system, school aid reform will not cause significant improvement in educational service in the Commonwealth.

RECOMMENDATION #22: ALL FUTURE ATTEMPTS AT SCHOOL AID REFORM SHOULD BE PURSUED IN RELATION TO THE TOTAL MUNICIPAL-STATE FINANCING PICTURE, NOT AS AN ACTION FOCUSED SOLELY ON EDUCATIONAL SERVICE INTERESTS.

Education is only one of the many functions, albeit an extremely important one, of state and local government. In a time of increasing fiscal pressure, the taxation impact of education must be coordinated with the taxation impact of all other governmental services. To promote this coordination, the Advisory Council on Education will join with the Massachusetts Taxpayers Foundation to publish an informational pamphlet on taxation-revenue relationships in the fall of 1974.

These recommendations are made to the General Court, the Governor, the Secretary of Educational Affairs, the State Board of Education, and all other groups interested in fiscal reform as it relates to schools. The interim report on which the recommendations are based follows.

INTERIM REPORT, STUDY ON SCHOOL FINANCE (May 3, 1974):

In recent years one of the most widely quoted "truisms" in the educational community and among social reformers has been the thought that the quality of a child's education cannot (or should not) be a function of the wealth of local districts.

Since the mid-1960's a series of court cases have been filed in federal courts alleging that various state systems for the financing of public schools were a violation of the equal protection guarantee of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The pace of the movement to reform the means of financing public education was vastly speeded up in 1971 with the ruling of the Supreme Court of California in the now famed "Serrano v. Priest" decision. In that case, it was ruled that education was a fundamental interest (i.e., right) and that the system of funding education in California discriminated against the poor because it made the quality of a child's education a function of the wealth of his parents and neighbors.

In the six months following the "Serrano" decision, no less than 30 suits were filed in state and federal courts. The situation may well be analogous to the precedent setting "Brown" case in 1954 where courts across the country quickly accepted a concept of legal

interpretation and supplanted the legislative bodies in effecting rapid changes in educational processes. Shortly after the "Serrano" decision at least eight other courts from as many states rendered decisions declaring state education financing schemes inequitable and thus denying equal protection to all persons.

The Supreme Court of the United States heard one of these cases — "Rodriquez v. San Antonio Independent School District — in March, 1973. In a close vote, the Court ruled that the Texas system of school finance was *not* in violation of the U.S. Constitution and that no case had really been made to establish that the process of education was, in fact, a fundamental interest.

The net result of the "Rodriquez" decision was that the large number of court cases disappeared almost as rapidly as they had appeared. In many states, however, the educational community and various coalitions of social and fiscal reformers kept up the pressure to alter programs of school finance to seek their stated goal — equity in fiscal resources to all communities.

In Massachusetts, like many other states, an annual series of bills are submitted to the state legislature to "reform" the method of financing public education in the Commonwealth. Since 1967, cities and towns have been receiving state aid and assistance designed to equalize the local funds available for education. Most of these "reform" efforts have been to try to refine the existing system either to raise the average percentage amount of entitlement or to eliminate the minimum and maximum aid restrictions. With very minor exceptions, the state funding program under Chapter 70 of the General Laws has changed very little since its inception.

The questionnaire associated with this study is intended to ascertain, among other goals, whether the case for the necessity of reforming the educational funding method has been made outside the educational community. Additionally, one of our goals is to try to determine whether the move to change the state aid program is based upon equity of educational programs and opportunities or whether it is based upon equity of fiscal resources — an assumption being made that a really good case for directly correlating the amount of money spent to the quality of education is yet to be made.

In a sampling of data received to date, the following positions seem to be evolving:

1) The quality of public schools — which is to say the degree to which valid educational results are being achieved — is a high level concern to over 70 percent of the respondents . . . . i.e., 70.59%. Put another way, 82.35% of the same respondents list the achieving of educational results for all children as one of the most important issues existing in the schools today. This ranks ahead of many of the more popularized issues being discussed regularly in the media —.i.e.,

Public involvement in schools
Behavior of youth — in and out of school
Racial and minority group issues
Funding of education
Education of youngsters with special handicaps
Efficiency of school operation
Quality of teaching staffs

2) The perceived quality of education is not totally equated to the quality of the schools. For instance, to the following selected points of view, a high percentage of the respondents indicate degrees of support:

a) The quality of education a child receives is a product of the quality of life of the whole community — not just the quality of his schools.

Strongly Support	41.2%
Mildly Support	35.3
No Opinion	——
Mildly Oppose	17.7
Strongly Oppose	5.8

b) Equal educational opportunity requires local commitment to the interests of each student more than it requires money.

Strongly Support	52.9%
Mildly Support	29.4
No Opinion	——
Mildly Oppose	11.8
Strongly Oppose	5.9

c) Equal educational opportunity requires unequal allocation of funds to local school districts.

Strongly Support	12.5%
Mildly Support	56.2
No Opinion	——
Mildly Oppose	25.2
Strongly Oppose	6.1

3) A general concern is expressed in most of the questionnaires returned that increased state funding would likely lead to increasing the degree of state control and regulation over local educational issues. To this issue, respondents indicated the following preferences concerning state control in seven selected categories.

	Increase in state control/regulation should evolve	Local control should continue
(a) Educational goals and priority setting	47.06%	52.94%
(b) Minimum standards established	82.35	17.65
(c) Budget review and approval	5.88	94.12
(d) Academic proficiency levels	56.25	43.75
(e) Evaluation of programs	53.33	46.67
(f) Staff and teacher's salaries	29.41	70.59
(g) School district size and organization	68.75	31.25

In another related area, to the question of setting minimum standards for school district operation, 73.3% of the respondents felt that guidelines in this area should be issued by the state with specific local standards remaining a factor of local option.

Early interpretation of data available would lead one to conclude that the political respondents to the questionnaire -- i.e., elected municipal officials and legislators — see problems of educational equity and quality control in the schools to be a bigger hurdle to face than the finding of more money for school districts. Interviews and comments on many of the questionnaire returns reflect a very real concern that safeguards be built into any increased state funding to insure that the "new money go for increasing programs and not just for teacher and administrative salary increases."

In general, high percentages of respondents in all three groups — school officials, municipal officials, and legislators — see the question of schools finance as only one part of general fiscal reform in the Commonwealth. 76.47% of this preliminary sample strongly indicate that school funding programs should be considered as only part of a comprehensive reform package. To separate it from a comprehensive package with wide-spread support is destined to bring about no reform.

VIII. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND COST ESTIMATES

Some of the Commission's recommendations can be implemented with existing resources. The cost of pursuing others will depend upon the details of implementation that are selected. Therefore we offer this summary as a set of guidelines open to change.

Most importantly, we wish to emphasize the need to avoid the most undesirable cost of all — the cost of NOT implementing general management procedures to equalize educational opportunities and to promote cooperative educational ventures in Massachusetts. We can survive financial pressures and do more to solve the serious problems of our society by working together more effectively. Unless we do this, the problems of our society will grow even more serious.

Under the press of daily business and previously established priorities, it is easy for us to define reasons for not pursuing new recommendations. Yet if equality of opportunity and effectiveness and efficiency in education are to be realized to the degree deserved by our youngsters and other citizens, we must find the time and the strength and the spirit to pursue these recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION #1: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND ITS COMMISSIONER SHOULD TAKE STEPS IN 1974 TO DEVELOP A STATEWIDE SERVICE EVALUATION-AND-ASSISTANCE SYSTEM THROUGH REGIONAL EDUCATION CENTERS, A SYSTEM DESIGNED TO MEASURE AND PROMOTE AVAILABILITY OF THE NINETEEN CATEGORIES OF SERVICE LISTED IN THIS REPORT IN EACH PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT IN THE COMMONWEALTH.

We believe that it is possible to develop this system with little or no additional cost beyond reallocation of existing human resources. Many citizens would be willing to give time to such a worthy and exciting endeavor. Advisory councils in each regional education center could be a primary source of volunteers for a system that could be a very strong stimulus to equality of opportunity in education.

RECOMMENDATION #2: LEGISLATIVE LEADERS AND THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD JOIN IN REVIEWING AND, AS NECESSARY, AGAIN AMENDING SECTION 16D OF CHAPTER 71 OF THE GENERAL LAWS TO ENSURE THAT INCENTIVES FOR REGIONALIZATION APPLY TO ALL REGIONAL DISTRICTS IN MASSACHUSETTS. THIS SECTION OF THE GENERAL LAWS SHOULD BE REVIEWED ALONG WITH ANY FUTURE PROPOSALS FOR MAJOR REFORM IN MASSACHUSETTS.
While additional amendments might add some cost to the state budget, relating regional aid to the actual number of students in regional membership makes this a cost reducing package.

RECOMMENDATION #3: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD FOLLOW THREE BASIC DIRECTIONS IN APPROVING PROPOSALS FOR FORMATION OF NEW OR EXPANSION OF EXISTING SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

A. DEVELOP K-12 SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT:
   1. ADEQUATELY MEET THE NEEDS OF ALL TOWNS IN A PARTICULAR AREA, EXCLUDING NO COMMUNITY THAT NEEDS MEMBERSHIP TO SERVE ITS STUDENTS PROPERLY.
   2. ENCOMPASS AN ADEQUATE PUPIL BASE. Refer to Appendix A for guidance on this criterion.
   3. EXPAND PARTIAL REGIONAL DISTRICTS TO INCLUDE ALL GRADES IN THEIR MEMBER TOWNS. Refer to Appendix B for guidance on this criterion.

B. DEVELOP K-12 SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT POSSESS THE CAPABILITY OF PROVIDING A HIGH QUALITY OF SERVICE IN EACH OF THE NINETEEN CATEGORIES LISTED ON PAGES 4-6 OF THIS REPORT.

C. DEVELOP AN ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM IN WHICH A SUPERINTENDENT IS RESPONSIBLE TO ONLY ONE SCHOOL COMMITTEE NO MATTER HOW MANY COMMUNITIES ARE SERVED.

and

RECOMMENDATION #4: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD DEFINE AND PROPOSE AND THE GENERAL COURT AND THE GOVERNOR SHOULD APPROVE LEGISLATION ABOLISHING SUPERINTENDENCY UNIONS BY JULY OF 1978.

Use of these guidelines would increase efficiency on the local district level, thus giving the state more value for dollars spent on educational aid without any increase in the state budget.

RECOMMENDATION #5: THE BOARD OF EDUCATION SUPPORTED BY THE GENERAL COURT AND THE GOVERNOR SHOULD TAKE IMMEDIATE ACTION TO INCLUDE AN EDUCATIONAL SERVICE UNIT (ESU) IN EACH REGIONAL CENTER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. EACH OF THESE UNITS SHOULD HAVE TWO BASIC TASKS: FIRST, SUPPORTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF VOLUNTARY COLLABORATIVES BOTH IN THE REGION AND ACROSS REGIONAL LINES AND, SECOND, ESTABLISHING SUCH MANDATORY REGIONAL SERVICE AS MIGHT BE APPROVED BY A REGIONAL ESU COUNCIL AND THE COMMISSIONER.

and

RECOMMENDATION #6: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD DEFINE AND PROPOSE AND THE GENERAL COURT AND THE GOVERNOR SHOULD APPROVE ANY LEGISLATION NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT THE OPERATION OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICE UNITS.

Unless the State Board of Education can pursue part of this development through reallocation of existing personnel resources, full implementation of this recommendation could add $258,000 to the annual budget of the Department of Education. However, the long-term return from establishing a regional system for stimulating and coordinating growth of educational collaboratives could be much higher than $258,000 in terms of both service to citizens and cost savings.

RECOMMENDATION #7: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION IN CONSULTATION WITH:

A. THE LEADERSHIP OF THE GENERAL COURT

B. THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS

C. THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

D. THE MASSACHUSETTS ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION, AND

E. THE INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

SHOULD DEFINE AND PROPOSE AND THE GENERAL COURT AND GOVERNOR SHOULD APPROVE LEGISLATION CREATING AN EDUCATIONAL BANK FOR PROMOTION OF COLLABORATIVES.

Creation of this bank for supporting a business-like approach to organizational development in public education might be arranged with federal or private grants and/or with an initial state appropriation of approximately $300,000. The bank could then become self-supporting.

RECOMMENDATION #8: THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION, THE BOARD OF STATE COLLEGES AND THE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD JOIN IN ESTABLISHING A COMMONWEALTH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE CENTER AS PART OF OR LINKED TO AN EXISTING MASSACHUSETTS STATE COLLEGE.

Assuming the availability of space and equipment at a state college, the annual operating cost for such a center could fall between $135,000 and $150,000. The potential for an increase in the comprehensiveness and efficiency of school-college collaboration would be at least this great on an annual basis.

RECOMMENDATION #9: THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS, THE CHANCELLOR OF HIGHER EDUCATION, AND THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION SHOULD GIVE STRONG ATTENTION TO ENSURING THAT CERTAIN ACTIONS OF LEADERSHIP AND COORDINATION CONTINUE TO BE ADDRESSED AS REGIONAL APPROACHES ARE PURSUED.

This recommendation does not require budget support. However it does imply the need for an added time commitment to coordination activities. The Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education will define more specific suggestions on how such an added time commitment can be arranged in schedules that are already very demanding. These suggestions will be communicated to appropriate boards and officers in late 1974.

RECOMMENDATION #10: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD DEFINE AND PROPOSE AND THE GENERAL COURT AND THE GOVERNOR SHOULD APPROVE ANY LEGISLATION NEEDED TO FACILITATE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ALTERNATIVE SYSTEMS FOR DELIVERY OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION SERVICES INCLUDING VARIATIONS OF BOTH THE BLUE HILLS MODEL FROM MASSACHUSETTS AND THE REGIONAL OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM MODEL FROM CALIFORNIA (ROP).

and

RECOMMENDATION #11: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD CONTINUE TO USE STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDS AND NEGOTIATIONS WITH DISTRICTS REQUESTING THESE FUNDS TO PROMOTE EXPANSION OF ALTERNATIVE SYSTEMS FOR DELIVERY OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION IN MASSACHUSETTS.

and

RECOMMENDATION #12: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION IN CONSULTATION WITH THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE BOARD OF REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD ACT AT ONCE TO ESTABLISH AN OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION TASK FORCE IN EACH REGIONAL EDUCATION CENTER. THE TASK FORCE IN EACH REGION SHOULD BE CHARGED WITH REPORTING ON THE AVAILABILITY OF OCCUPATIONAL SERVICE ACROSS THE REGION AND, WHERE APPROPRIATE, WITH DEFINING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCREASING THE LEVEL AND/OR EFFICIENCY OF THAT SERVICE.

and

RECOMMENDATION #13: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE COMMISSIONER SHOULD HAVE THE DIVISION OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION CONTINUE ENCOURAGING MIDDLE SCHOOLS AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS THRU THE 10TH LEVEL TO INITIATE OR EXPAND MORE EFFECTIVE CAREER EXPLORATION AND PRE-VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS. IN ADDITION, THEY SHOULD BE DIRECTED TO GIVE EQUAL PRIORITY TO WORKING WITH VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS TO DEVELOP A STATEWIDE PLAN FOR (1) EXPANDING THEIR CAPACITY TO SERVE STUDENTS ON LEVELS 11 AND 12 AND (2) ESTABLISHING THEIR ROLE AS REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS FOR OCCUPATIONAL OR CAREER-ORIENTED PROGRAMS.

Considering the federal funds that are made available to support development in this area, the major need is for added strategic planning (enabling legislation, new guidelines for awarding grants, etc.) rather than adding funding.

RECOMMENDATION #14: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD ENSURE THAT THE BOSTON, WORCESTER, AND SPRINGFIELD REGIONAL EDUCATION CENTERS AND/OR ASSOCIATED CITIZEN RESOURCE CENTERS ARE READILY ACCESSIBLE TO URBAN RESIDENTS. THE BOARD SHOULD ALSO PROPOSE LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CREATE A STUDY COMMISSION TO DETERMINE THE VALUE AND FEASIBILITY OF RELOCATING CENTRAL OFFICES OF THE DEPARTMENT AND OTHER STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.

Relocation of regional centers might involve some added rental costs. However we believe that such costs need not be significantly greater than present rental costs. We cannot offer estimates on any costs that would be associated with relocation of central offices of state educational agencies; defining such estimates should be one of the tasks of the study commission proposed in this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION #15: THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS SHOULD REQUEST STATE BOARDS AND OFFICES OF EDUCATION ON ALL LEVELS TO JOIN HIM NOW IN ESTABLISHING A PLANNING PROCESS AND SCHEDULE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A STATEWIDE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR EDUCATION. THE PLANNING SHOULD EMPHASIZE COORDINATED COLLECTION OF USEFUL INFORMATION AND MAKING THE INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO LEGISLATORS, MINORITY GROUPS, OTHER CITIZENS, AND LOCAL SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES RATHER THAN SIMPLY SERVING PLANNING NEEDS OF THE STATE BOARDS AND OFFICES.

Assuming the inevitability of improvement in the statewide management of information gathering and dissemination, coordination of this sort will reduce rather than increase long-term costs.

RECOMMENDATION #16: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD PROPOSE AND THE GENERAL COURT AND THE GOVERNOR SHOULD APPROVE THE APPOINTMENT OF A DEPUTY LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR FOR MINORITY CONCERNS AND EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY.

Such an appointment would add at least $30,000 to the annual budget of the Department of Education. However this would be a very worthwhile investment in focusing more comprehensive attention on serious issues in our Commonwealth.

RECOMMENDATION #17: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND ITS COMMISSIONER SHOULD ACT IMMEDIATELY TO SUPPORT THE EFFORTS OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL COMMITTEES IN DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING A GREATER EXPANDED ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEMBERS.

Increasing the level of assistance to school committees should add some relatively minor expenses to the annual budget of the Department of Education (for publications, travel, and consultant fees). However we believe that the increased assistance could be provided without any significant rise in personnel costs by seeking the help of existing agencies and volunteers from the business community.

RECOMMENDATION #18: THE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD SUPPORT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A CITIZEN RESOURCE CENTER IN ASSOCIATION WITH EACH REGIONAL EDUCATION CENTER.

Implementation of this recommendation would add approximately $10,000 per center to the annual budget of the Department of Education.

RECOMMENDATION #19: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD PROVIDE THE PUBLIC WITH A DETAILED ANALYSIS OF DECENTRALIZATION PLANS FOR THE BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS BY OCTOBER OF 1974. THIS ANALYSIS SHOULD BE BASED ON A COMPARISON WITH THE 1970 REPORT ENTITLED *ORGANIZING AN URBAN SCHOOL SYSTEM FOR DIVERSITY — A STUDY OF THE BOSTON SCHOOL DEPARTMENT*.

Providing the public with an analysis on this issue can be done without the expenditure of additional money. We state this with full recognition that getting involved with this controversial issue would require expenditures of time and emotion. The potential effects of these expenditures can be best judged by those to whom the recommendation has been made.

RECOMMENDATION #20: THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD PROVIDE A STAFF UNIT IN THE BOSTON REGIONAL EDUCATION CENTER TO PLAN, ENCOURAGE, AND ADMINISTRATE IMPLEMENTATION OF AT LEAST TWO MODEL RECOMMENDA-

TIONS FROM THE METROPOLITAN PLANNING PROJECT — A PATHWAYS MODEL FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS AND A PAIRWAYS MODEL FOR ELEMENTARY STUDENTS. THE GENERAL COURT AND THE GOVERNOR SHOULD ACT TO PROVIDE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF BOTH THE STAFF UNIT AND THE SUBSEQUENT IMPLEMENTATION OF MODELS.

The Commission defers to the staff of the Metropolitan Planning Project in preparing cost estimates for implementation of the models defined by that staff. We hope that creation of an appropriate staff unit in the Boston regional education center can be managed within the context of recent decentralization activities in the Department of Education.

RECOMMENDATION #21: ALL FUTURE ATTEMPTS AT SCHOOL AID REFORM SHOULD BE PURSUED WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF ORGANIZATIONAL REFORM FOR EQUALIZATION OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY.

and

RECOMMENDATION #22: ALL FUTURE ATTEMPTS AT SCHOOL AID REFORM SHOULD BE PURSUED IN RELATION TO THE TOTAL MUNICIPAL-STATE FINANCING PICTURE, NOT AS AN ACTION FOCUSED SOLELY ON EDUCATIONAL SERVICE INTERESTS.
These recommendations are made for strategic planning purposes and do not have immediate cost implications.

Questions on these recommendations and associated cost estimates may be referred to The Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, 182 Tremont Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02111.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE LIST OF POTENTIAL K-12 REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS BASED UPON APPROACHING A MINIMUM OF 3500 STUDENTS

There are many possible combinations other than those shown in this list. While distance and other factors remove the feasibility of every district including a minimum of 3500 students, the sample list was constructed with this guideline in mind. The October 1, 1972 enrollment figures include students who were enrolled in regional vocational schools but not those who were sent to other districts under tuition plans.

No.	*School District*	*Enrollment*	*Total*
1.	Berkshire Hills	2,533	
	Southern Berkshire	1,297	
	Mt. Washington		3,830
2.	Lee	1,533	
	Lenox	1,335	
	Richmond	389	
	Tyringham	20	3,277
3.	Mt. Greylock	1,189	
	Williamstown	858	
	Lanesborough	482	
	Hancock	160	
	New Ashford		2,689
4.	Adams — Cheshire	2,821	
	Savoy	42	2,863
5.	Clarksburg	389	
	Florida	180	
	Monroe	43	
	North Adams	3,594	4,206
6.	Central Berkshire	2,872	2,872
7.	Otis	222	
	Sandisfield	100	
	Granville	375	
	Southwick	2,013	
	Tolland		2,710
8.	Gateway	1,792	
	Hampshire	723	
	Chesterfield	148	
	Goshen	101	
	Southampton	471	
	Westhampton	116	3,351
9.	Mohawk Trail	1,044	
	Buckland — Shelburne	719	
	Ashfield	198	
	Buckland		
	Charlemont		
	Colrain		
	Hawlemont	181	
	Hawley		
	Heath		
	Plainfield		
	Rowe	86	2,228

No.	*School District*	*Enrollment*	*Total*
10.	Hatfield	654	
	Hadley	691	
	Williamsburg	574	
	Frontier	687	
	Conway	128	
	Deerfield	449	
	Sunderland	152	
	Whately	115	3,450
11.	Hampden — Wilbraham	1,540	
	Hampden	2,625	
	Wilbraham	1,124	5,289
12.	Granby	1,632	
	Belchertown	1,317	
	Ware	1,620	4,571
13.	Amherst — Pelham	1,844	
	Amherst	1,977	
	Leverett	142	
	Pelham	144	
	Schutesbury	103	4,210
14.	Gill — Montague	800	
	Gill	218	
	Montague	676	
	Mahar	1,082	
	Erving	193	
	New Salem	71	
	Orange	891	
	Petersham	140	
	Wendell	47	4,118
15.	Athol — Royalston	1,280	
	Athol	1,222	
	Royalston	92	
	Pioneer Valley	617	
	Leydon	58	
	Bernardston	226	
	Northfield	315	
	Warwick	53	3,863
16.	Quabbin	981	
	Barre	506	
	Hardwick	315	
	Hubbardston	456	
	Oakham	94	
	Narragansett	867	
	Philipston	153	
	Templeton	751	4,124
17.	Spencer — East Brookfield	722	
	Spencer	1,479	
	East Brookfield	345	
	North Brookfield	1,212	
	New Braintree	92	3,850

No.	School District	Enrollment	Total
18.	West Brookfield	446	
	Warren	454	
	Warren — West Brookfield	729	
	Palmer	2,534	4,163
19.	Tantasqua	1,378	
	Brimfield	284	
	Brookfield	298	
	Holland	184	
	Sturbridge	922	
	Wales	161	
	Monson	1,546	4,773
20.	Charlton — Dudley	2,799	
	Southbridge	3,051	5,850
21.	Paxton	1,000	
	Leicester	2,061	3,061
22.	Holden	3,000	
	Rutland	650	3,650
23.	Ashburnham — Westminster	952	
	Ashburnham	608	
	Westminster	591	
	Princeton	500	
	Sterling	1,244	3,895
24.	Gardner	3,164	
	Winchendon	1,671	4,835
25.	North Middlesex	3,503	
	Lunenburg	2,278	5,781
26.	Groton	1,336	
	Dunstable	300	
	Tyngsborough	1,186	2,822
27.	Ayer	3,903	
	Shirley	601	
	Harvard	831	5,335
28.	Westford	3,363	
	Littleton	1,886	5,249
29.	Acton — Boxborough	2,426	
	Acton	2,393	
	Boxborough	254	5,073
30.	Nashoba	827	
	Bolton	435	
	Lancaster	668	
	Stow	948	
	Maynard	2,084	4,962
31.	Boylston — Berlin	671	
	Berlin	381	
	Boylston	403	
	Clinton	2,035	
	West Boylston	1,570	5,060
32.	Northborough — Southborough	1,229	
	Northborough	2,254	
	Southborough	1,353	4,836

No.	School District	Enrollment	Total
33.	Grafton	2,772	
	Millbury	2,637	5,409
34.	Oxford	3,041	
	Sutton	1,157	4,198
35.	Douglas	734	
	Webster	2,490	3,224
36.	Northbridge	2,579	
	Uxbridge	1,865	4,444
37.	Mendon — Upton	1,452	
	Hopedale	1,030	
	Blackstone — Millville	972	
	Blackstone	930	
	Millville	417	4,801
38.	Medway	2,566	
	Millis	1,762	4,328
39.	Dover — Sherborn	1,083	
	Dover	591	
	Sherborn	614	
	Medfield	2,781	5,069
40.	Ashland	2,356	
	Hopkinton	1,556	3,912
41.	Lincoln	3,549	
	Sudbury	1,792	
	Lincoln — Sudbury	1,954	7,295
42.	Concord — Carlisle	1,689	
	Concord	3,126	
	Carlisle	602	5,417
43.	King Philip	1,954	
	Norfolk	659	
	Wrentham	785	
	Plainville	753	4,151
44.	Avon	1,329	
	Holbrook	2,830	
	Abington	3,236	7,395
45.	Cohasset	1,991	
	Hull	3,096	5,087
46.	Nahant	829	
	Swampscott	3,072	3,901
47.	Masconomet	2,088	
	Boxford	694	
	Middleton	641	
	Topsfield	936	4,359
48.	Hamilton — Wenham	904	
	Hamilton	1,269	
	Wenham	596	
	Manchester	1,266	4,035
49.	Ipswich	2,729	
	Essex	586	3,315
50.	Gloucester	5,350	
	Rockport	1,012	6,362

No.	*School District*	*Enrollment*	*Total*
51.	Triton	1,483	
	Salisbury	765	
	Newbury	508	
	Rowley	423	
	Georgetown	1,708	4,887
52.	Pentucket	1,587	
	Merrimac	662	
	West Newbury	410	
	Groveland	249	2,908
53.	Amesbury	2,538	
	Newburyport	3,312	5,850
54.	Mansfield	2,797	
	Norton	2,207	5,004
55.	East Bridgewater	2,359	
	West Bridgewater	1,653	4,012
56.	Whitman — Hanson	1,548	
	Whitman	2,661	
	Hanson	1,548	5,757
57.	Norwell	2,698	
	Hanover	3,350	6,048
58.	Pembroke	3,208	
	Halifax	1,051	
	Plympton	353	4,612
59.	Duxbury	2,802	
	Kingston	1,506	4,308
60.	Seekonk	3,165	
	Rehoboth	1,318	
	Dighton	837	
	Dighton — Rehoboth	800	6,120
61.	Freetown	507	
	Lakeville	552	
	Freetown — Lakeville	1,647	
	Berkley	564	3,270
62.	Bridgewater	2,300	
	Raynham	1,600	
	Bridgewater — Raynham	1,355	5,255
63.	Plymouth	2,070	
	Carver	597	
	Plymouth — Carver	2,641	5,308
64.	Swansea	2,830	
	Somerset	4,627	7,457
65.	Westport	2,541	
	Dartmouth	4,419	6,870
66.	Acushnet	1,550	
	Fairhaven	3,312	4,862
67.	Rochester	269	
	Marion	519	
	Mattapoisset	733	
	Wareham	3,263	
	Old Rochester	1,133	5,917
68.	Bourne	3,700	3,700

No.	*School District*	*Enrollment*	*Total*
69.	Sandwich*	1,079	
	Mashpee*	240	1,319
70.	Falmouth	5,329	5,329
71.	Dennis	1,198	
	Yarmouth	2,325	
	Dennis — Yarmouth	1,474	4,997
72.	Provincetown	762	
	Truro	148	
	Wellfleet	139	
	Eastham	188	
	Orleans	243	
	Chatham	974	
	Brewster	180	
	Harwich	1,575	
	Nauset	1,471	5,380
73.	Martha's Vineyard	479	
	Chilmark	19	
	Edgartown	252	
	Gay Head		
	Oak Bluffs	256	
	Tisbury	448	
	West Tisbury	41	1,495

*Listed separately in view of recent dissolution of a union with Bourne. Other combinations are possible with Bourne and/or Falmouth. Mashpee figure does not include secondary students who are enrolled elsewhere on a tuition basis.

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE LIST OF POTENTIAL K-12 REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS BASED UPON EXPANSION OF ALL EXISTING NON-VOCATIONAL REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The enrollment figures used for this list refer to October 1, 1972.

No.	*School District*	*Enrollment*	*Total*
1.	Acton — Boxborough	2,426	
	Acton	2,393	
	Boxborough	254	5,073
2.	Adams — Cheshire	2,734	
	Adams		
	Cheshire		2,734
3.	Amherst — Pelham	1,844	
	Amherst	1,977	
	Leverett	142	
	Pelham	144	
	Shutesbury	103	4,210
4.	Ashburnham — Westminster	952	
	Ashburnham	608	
	Westminster	591	2,151
5.	Athol — Royalston	1,280	
	Athol	1,222	
	Royalston	84	2,586
6.	Berkshire Hills	2,533	
	Great Barrington		
	Stockbridge		
	West Stockbridge		2,533
7.	Berlin — Boylston	671	
	Berlin	381	
	Boylston	402	1,455
8.	Blackstone — Millville	972	
	Blackstone	899	
	Millville	304	2,175
9.	Bridgewater — Raynham	1,355	
	Bridgewater	2,300	
	Raynham	1,600	5,255
10.	Central Berkshire	2,872	
	Becket Cummington		
	Dalton Peru		
	Hinsdale Washington		
	Windsor		2,872
11.	Concord — Carlisle	1,689	
	Carlisle	602	
	Concord	3,126	5,417
12.	Dennis — Yarmouth	1,474	
	Dennis	1,198	
	Yarmouth	2,325	4,997
13.	Dighton — Rehoboth	800	
	Dighton	837	
	Rehoboth	1,318	2,955

No.	*School District*	*Enrollment*	*Total*
14.	Dover — Sherborn	1,083	
	Dover	591	
	Sherborn	614	2,288
15.	Nauset	1,471	
	Eastham	188	
	Orleans	243	
	Wellfleet	139	2,041
16.	Freetown — Lakeville	1,647	
	Freetown	507	
	Lakeville	552	2,706
17.	Frontier	687	
	Conway	128	
	Deerfield	449	
	Sunderland	152	
	Whately	115	1,531
18.	Gateway	1,792	
	Blanford Montgomery		
	Chester Russell		
	Huntington Worthington		
	Middlefield		1,792
19.	Gill — Montague	800	
	Gill	218	
	Montague	676	1,694
20.	Groton — Dunstable	1,584	
	Dunstable		
	Groton		1,584
21.	Hamilton — Wenham	904	
	Hamilton	1,269	
	Wenham	596	2,769
22.	Hampden — Wilbraham	1,540	
	Hampden	2,625	
	Wilbraham	1,124	5,289
23.	Hampshire	973	
	Chesterfield	148	
	Goshen	101	
	Southampton	471	
	Westhampton	116	
	Williamsburg	324	2,133
24.	King Philip	1,954	
	Norfolk	659	
	Plainville	753	
	Wrentham	785	4,151
25.	Lincoln — Sudbury	1,954	
	Lincoln	3,549	
	Sudbury	1,792	7,295
26.	Ralph C. Mahar	1,082	
	Erving	193	
	New Salem	71	
	Orange	891	
	Petersham	140	
	Wendell	47	2,424

No.	School District	Enrollment	Total
27.	Martha's Vineyard	479	
	Chilmark	19	
	Edgartown	252	
	Gay Head		
	Oak Bluffs	256	
	Tisbury	448	
	West Tisbury	41	1,495
28.	Masconomet	2,088	
	Boxford	694	
	Middleton	641	
	Topsfield	936	4,359
29.	Mendon — Upton	1,408	
	Mendon		
	Upton		1,408
30.	Mohawk Trail	1,044	
	Ashfield	198	
	Buckland*	719	
	Charlemont*	181	
	Colrain*		
	Hawley*		
	Heath*		
	Plainfield*		
	Rowe	86	
	Shelburne		2,228
31.	Mount Greylock	1,189	
	Lanesborough	482	
	Williamstown	825	2,496
32.	Narragansett	867	
	Phillipston	153	
	Templeton	751	1,771
33.	Nashoba	827	
	Bolton	435	
	Lancaster	668	
	Stow	948	2,878
34.	Northborough — Southborough	1,229	
	Northborough	2,254	
	Southborough	1,353	4,836
35.	North Middlesex	3,475	
	Pepperell		
	Townsend		3,475
36.	Old Rochester	1,133	
	Marion	494	
	Mattapoisett	733	
	Rochester	269	2,629
37.	Pentucket	1,587	
	Groveland	249	
	Merrimac	662	
	West Newbury	410	2,908

* These towns are already regionalized on a K-6 basis.

No.	*School District*	*Enrollment*	*Total*
38.	Pioneer Valley	617	
	Bernardston	226	
	Leyden	58	
	Northfield	315	
	Warwick	53	1,269
39.	Plymouth — Carver	2,641	
	Carver	597	
	Plymouth	2,070	5,308
40.	Quabbin	981	
	Barre	482	
	Hardwick	316	
	Hubbardston	443	
	Oakham	94	2,316
41.	Silver Lake	2,597	
	Halifax	625	
	Kingston	790	
	Pembroke	1,920	
	Plympton	186	6,118
42.	Southern Berkshire	1,297	
	Alford		
	Egremont		
	Monterey		
	New Marlborough		
	Sheffield		1,297
43.	Spencer — East Brookfield	722	
	East Brookfield	345	
	Spencer	1,479	2,546
44.	Tantasqua	1,378	
	Brimfield	284	
	Brookfield	298	
	Holland	184	
	Sturbridge	922	
	Wales	161	3,227
45.	Triton	1,483	
	Newbury	508	
	Rowley	423	
	Salisbury	765	3,179
46.	Wachusett	1,902	
	Holden	2,041	
	Paxton	644	
	Princeton	353	
	Rutland	513	
	Sterling	892	6,345
47.	Warren — West Brookfield	729	
	Warren	454	
	West Brookfield	446	1,629
48.	Whitman — Hanson	1,548	
	Hanson	1,548	
	Whitman	2,661	5,757
49.	Dudley Charlton	2,548	
	Dudley		
	Charlton		2,548

Some Other Recent Reports Of
The Massachusetts Advisory Council On Education

TITLE	*AUTHOR*	*WHERE AVAILABLE*
Aid to Private Higher Education in Massachusetts	Frederick E. Terman	MACE
Higher Education in Massachusetts: A New Look at Some Major Policy Issues	Academy for Educational Development	MACE Summary Only
Strengthening the Alternative Post-Secondary Education System: Continuing and Part-Time Study in Massachusetts	University Consultants, Inc.	MACE 4-page Summary Only
Something of Value (Summary) and Elementary Science Handbook	Office of Instructional Research and Evaluation Harvard University	MACE
The Here, Now and Tomorrow of Cable Television in Education .... A Planning Guide	Creative Studies, Inc.	MACE
Modernizing School Governance for Educational Equality and Diversity	Paul W. Cook, Jr.	MACE
Massachusetts Schools: Past, Present and Possible	Richard H. de Lone	MACE
Child Care in Massachusetts: The Public Responsibility	Richard R. Rowe	ERIC ED#065-174 (full)
A Systems Approach for Massachusetts Schools: A Study of School Building Costs	Campbell, Aldrich & Nulty	ERIC ED#060 531 (full) ED#060 530 (summary)
Organizing an Urban School System for Diversity	Joseph M. Cronin	D. C. Heath Publishing Co. Lexington, MA
Continuing Education in Massachusetts: State Programs for the 70's	Melvin Levin Joseph Slavet	D. C. Heath Publishing Co. Lexington, MA
Guidelines for Planning and Constructing Community Colleges	Bruce Dunsmore	ERIC ED#034 390
Pupil Services for Massachusetts Schools	Gordon Liddle and Arthur Kroll	ERIC ED#037 767
Take a Giant Step: Evaluation of Selected Aspects of Project 750	Herbert Hoffman	ERIC ED#061 695
Teacher Certification and Preparation in Massachusetts	Lindley J. Stiles	ERIC ED#027 243

A List Of Other Mace Projects Underway At The Time Of This Printing

SPECIAL EDUCATION COLLABORATIVES — developing recommendations and resource materials needed to promote collaboratives under Chapter 766.

FINANCE INFORMATION — producing an informational pamphlet on taxation-revenue relationships.

FINANCE REFORM — developing recommendations on the basis of relating equalization principles to attitudes and opinions of political and educational leaders.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION — developing resource materials and alternatives to promote positive citizen involvement in educational decision making.

STUDENT RECORDS — assisting the Department of Education in developing regulations and guidelines governing school records.

ELEMENTARY SCIENCE — assisting interested school districts in evaluating and improving elementary science programs.

VANDALISM — developing resource materials for school districts interested in designing and maintaining school buildings to reduce damage from vandalism.

URBAN READING PROGRAMS — analyzing factors that influence the degree of success achieved by urban school reading programs.

HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMAS — defining and proposing a statewide system for flexibility and control of quality of student achievement in awarding high school diplomas.

SCHOOLS AND THE ELDERLY — defining and proposing actions to promote mutually beneficial relationships between the elderly and schools/colleges.

COLLEGE TEACHING — defining and proposing actions to assist college and universities in their design of systems for evaluating and improving teaching practices on the college level.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Report of The Governor's Commission on
School District Organization and Collaboration

From The Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education
182 Tremont Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02111